Keith against Keith;

OR SOME MORE OF

George Keith's

Contradictions and Absurdities,

Collected out of his own Books (not yet Retracted) upon a Review.

TOGETHER WITH A

REPLY

TO

George Keith's Late Book, Entituled, *The Antichrists and Sadduces detected among a sort of* Quakers, *&c.*

By JOHN PENINGTON.

A Double-minded Man is unstable in all his Ways, James 1. 8.

They that observe lying Vanities, forsake their own Mercy, Jonah 2. 8.

LONDON:

Printed, and Sold by *T. Sowle* near the *Meeting-House* in *White-Hart* Court in *Gracious-Street*, 1696.

42

P

l. th
and
34. l
l. 15
ers i
l. 17
f. th
l. 20
r. bo
112.
l. 10
this
p. 1

ERRATA.

PAge 4. line 7. f. as r. or, p. 14. l. 27. r. *Evangelist*, p. 21. l. 30. f. the r. that, p. 22. l. 32. r. those, p. 24. l. 28. r. *Propose*, p. 28. l. 27. f. *teacheth* r. *treateth*, p. 29. l. 18. f. *the* r. *that*, l. 25. r. *never*, l. 29. r. p, 70. p. 31. l. 30. r. *and honest*, p. 32. l. 17. r. *outwardly*, p. 33. l. 1. r. *promise*, p. 34. l. 1. f. *they* r. *that*, p. 40. l. 4. *after that dele which*, p. 41. l. 13. f. *and* r. *to*, l. 29. f. *outward* r. *outer*, p. 59. l. 21. r. *bearers in*, *in order*, p. 61. l. 2. f. as r. or, p. 64. l. 7. r. Penington's l. 17. f. *where* r. *whence*, p. 65. l. 21. f. on r. in, p. 66. l. 24. f. *these* r. *those*, p. 77. l. 13. r. *Rector's*, p. 80. l. 14. r. *believed*. l. 20. f. on r. in, p. 81. l. 3. r. *who*, *and goes on*, p. 89. l. 3. r. *hold*, p. 101. l. 4. f. 127. r. 117. p. 106. l. 1. r. *as well as*, p. 112. l. 27. f. *would* r. *could* p. 120. l. 27. r. *asketh if that*, p, 123. l. 10. f. *the* r. *t* at, P. 131. l. 31. r, *chargeth*, p. 139. l. 24. r. *this which he calls*, p. 145. l. 4. f. *an* r. *and*, l. 9. r. *Popery*, p. 146. l. 22. *for* ad huc r. adhuc. l. 33. r. *voeten*,

KEITH against KEITH:

OR

Some more of *George Keith*'s Contradictions and Absurdities.

ALthough *G. Keith* blame us (in his *Advertisement*, p. 3.) for *heaping Book upon Book against him* (to which himself gave the *Provocation*) alledging want of *Time and Ability of outward Estate* (of whose *Sincerity* therein, the Reader may judge by his cutting out *new Work* of late in his *twelve Penny Narrative*) yet he continuing to abuse us in *Print*, 'tis fit we should *there* also vindicate our *Holy Profession* from his unjust *Defamations*. And having to do with an *unstable* Adversary, I had collected and digested a List of some more of his *Contradictions* and *Absurdities*, upon a review, which I now make *introductory* to the *Reply*; wherein if I exceed my wonted Brevity, know the variety of Subjects occasioned it: These I shall divide into two Heads, making his own Assertion in *Way to City of God*, Printed, *Anno* 1678. The Title of the *First*, his *Absurdities and Contradictions, promiscuously Collected* out of his Book, called, *Truth Advanced*,

Printed, *Anno* 1694. the *Second*: And then enter upon defending my Self and Friends from his late false Charges in his late Book, stiled, *The Antichrists and Sadducees detected among a sort of Quakers*, &c.

1. *That through the coming of Jesus Christ in the inward, even* before *he was outwardly come as manifest, many were* saved, *and attained unto* perfect *Peace and Reconciliation with God in their Souls.* (*Way to City of God*, p. 125.)

And the Method I shall take here, shall be *first* to set down what I find in his later Books, and *then* confront him out of his former; and that the rather, for that in his *Serious Appeal*, (Printed, *Anno* 1692.) p. 21. he saith, 'Let 'but the Reader see my own Words in my 'Printed Books, and well consider them, and 'if he have but a little sound Judgment, he will 'easily find, I have not contradicted my self in 'ANY THING. Upon this Issue, I am willing to leave it with the *Considerate* and *Judicious* (though perhaps *G. Keith* will allow none to be such, but who say as he saith) and begin with the *Christian Faith*, &c. *Vindicated*, &c. (Printed, *Anno* 1692.) where he with others thus deliver themselves.

'Though we do affirm, that all conscienti-'ous and honest *Gentiles*, such as *Cornelius* was 'before the Faith of Christ was preached to 'him, have some measure of Light from Christ, 'to enlighten them, and are under some Ad-'ministration of the Spirit, yet it is but the '*first* Ministration, until the Knowledge and 'Faith of Christ, as he died for our Sins, and

'rose

'rose again, &c. be spiritually received. And 'such, who have the true and saving Know-'ledge and Faith of Christ, as he dyed and rose 'again without them — are ONLY *Christians*, 'and Sons of God, of the free Woman, having 'receiving the Spirit of *Adoption*, whereby they 'cry *Abba, Father*: But who have not this 'Faith of Christ, crucified and raised again out-'wardly, spiritually receiv'd and wrought in 'them, by the Spirit of Christ; Whether they 'have, or have not heard Christ outwardly 'Preached unto them, are at BEST (however '*Just* and *Conscientious* to the *just Principle of God* 'in them) not under the *second*, and more pecu-'liar Ministration of God's Spirit, that makes 'Men worthy to be esteemed *Christians*, but 'are only under the first; and such are held 'under the *Custody* or *Safeguard* of the Law, 'shut up unto the Faith that is afterwards to 'be revealed, as *Paul* declared, *Gal.* 3. 23. And 'the State, they are in, under this first Mini-'stration, is to them, as the *City of Refuge* was 'to the Man-slayer under the Law, *Christian Faith*, p. 6, 7. This Notion of the City of Re-fuge, &c. I having met with in other Books of his, and touched upon in mine, Entituled, *People called Quakers cleared*, &c. as smelling of the Doctrine of the *Revolution* of *humane Souls* (though *G. Keith* doth not care to hear of it) and contrary to the Scriptures, particularly *Eccles.* 11. 3. and *Heb.* 9. 27. I refer to what hath been said there, p. 33. and go on.

In his Book (without date) called, *Truth and Innocency Defended*, he saith, 'None are

'justified by Christ, but through Faith in him, 'as he dyed for them and rose again, *&c. For 'he that believeth not, is condemned already*, and 'therefore the Ministration of the Law, whether *outwardly* writ on Tables of Stone, or *inwardly* writ on Stony Hearts, is the *Ministration of Condemnation*, preparing for Christ, 'and leading unto Christ, and such who are 'under the Law (let them be ever so obedient, just and conscientious, because they have 'sinned, and *are not perfect*) are held under it, '*shut up as in a Custody, or Safeguard*, as the 'Manslayer in the City of Refuge, and are not 'perfectly justified, but are under Fear, their 'Thoughts Accusing and Excusing; for though 'they are excused or accused, or to say, justified in some good things done by them, yet 'that can be no *perfect Justification*, because their 'State is imperfect, p. 19, 20.

'By his Obedience unto Death and precious 'Blood, he hath procured and purchased for us 'that inward Principle of Gods Grace, whereby we are sanctified, *Further Discovery*, p. 17, '18. Printed, *Anno* 1694, If that inward Principle, whereby Men are sanctified, were purchased by Christs Death and Blood, what became of both *Jew* and *Gentile* before Christ's Death? Were they *without an inward Principle, and unsanctified?* Himself shall resolve the Question anon.

In his Book stiled *Truth Advanced*, Printed, *Anno* 1694. he thus hath it, 'It is not said that 'Cornelius had the Holy Ghost in his *Gentile* 'State, although he had a great measure of *Gen-*

'tile

'rile *Sincerity and Righteousne's.* Nor is it any 'where to be found, that ANY received that 'Holy Ghost, which Christ promised PARTICU-'LARLY to Believers in him, but such ONLY 'who believed in him, even Christ crucified and 'raised again, p. 70. And in the next Page, 'That Holiness that is a Conformity unto 'Christ the second *Adam*, and is the *proper* and '*peculiar* effect of the new or second Covenant, 'is far more excellent than any Righteousness 'or Obedience, that is but the effect of the 'first Covenant or Ministration, and is but a 'Conformity to the first *Adam*, his Righteous-'ness, and maketh not *Sons* but *Servants*, or if 'Sons, but Sons of *Hagar*, or the first Cove-'nant. And under this first Covenant Mini-'stration, the Spirit is called in them the Spi-'rit of Fear and Bondage, but the filial Fear, 'and Love, and other Gospel Vertues are the 'far more excellent: And here the Spirit is 'called, the Spirit of *Adoption* or *Sonship*, that 'helpeth us to cry *Abba, Father.* And as the 'Spirit of God is called in Scripture, the Spi-'rit of Faith, *&c.* So it is called the Holy Spi-'rit, or Spirit of Holiness, because it worketh 'a peculiar Degree and kind of Holiness, in all 'true Believers in Christ Crucified, *&c.* above 'what the most upright *Gentiles* do Witness or 'Experience in their *meer Gentile* State — *The* 'Law made nothing perfect*, and that Law was 'not only the Law without, but even the Law 'WITHIN, both in *Jews* and *Gentiles*, until the 'Faith of Christ, the one Offering, come to be 'revealed, by which *one Offering* he hath for

'ever perfected all that are sanctified, p. 71. Let the Reader bear these things in Mind, or recur to them upon occasion, for on this hinge hang most of the Observations in the ensuing Quotations, which belong to this Head.

Now before I bring his former Books in Evidence against him, I think needful to Premise, that I have not here delivered Mine or my Friends Sentiments *pro* or *con* (for or against) but barely wielded my Adversaries weapon against himself, for his Writings abound with Contradictions, as I have already observed in my *Apostate Exposed*, and that other called, *People called Quakers cleared*, &c. who though he could tell others, that, 'They are not so 'sincere as to own and retract in publick, their 'Errors exposed in publick, even lest such Re-'tractation or Correction should lessen and abate 'their Honour and Esteem among their too cre-'dulous Followers and Admirers. See *Preface* to *Gross Error*, p. 2. yet himself is the Man, that offends in that wherewith he unjustly taxeth others; forgetting (or at least little regarding) what *Paul* saith, *Rom.* 2. 21. *Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thy self*? &c. For although he represented his very minute, *viz. Not touching any of the great Doctrines and Principles of the Christian Religion, but relating to some Places of Scriptures unduly applied, to prove or defend things that were Truths, but did not really prove these Truths*, True Copy, p. 18. and hath promised to correct and retract them, p. 17. yet it remains undone to this Day, which is above a Year ago. If he be so unwil-

ling

ling to correct *small* faults, what would he be to *greater?* But before I have done with him, I doubt not to evince, he had no Reason to *cast the first Stone*, especially against the Innocent, when himself was so deeply culpable. To that end hear him, *Light of Truth Triumphing* (Printed *Anno* 1670.) thus

Light of Truth Triumphing. 1670.

'That the new Covenant requireth doing is 'plain from *Deut.* 30. 14. *But the Word is very 'near unto thee, even in thy Mouth*, &c. which '*Word* the Apostle *Paul* expounds to be the '*Word of Faith, and Righteousness of Faith* (*Rom.* '10. 8.) which he preached, and that was the 'NEW COVENANT, p. 11. Hence I argue, if the Word near, be the Word of Faith, *&c.* be the New Covenant, then who hear it and obey it, are not under the first Covenant *only*, held under the *Custody and Safe-guard of the Law*, &c. but the Word of Faith being closed in with, the Faith is revealed. And surely the New Covenant is *Saving* and *Perfecting*.

Page 15. He proposeth a few *Queries* to *R. Gordon*, to *shew* (as he alledgeth) *that the Nature and Light by which the* Gentiles *did the things contained in the Law, and* knew God, *was that of Christ.* 1. 'How could they do the things of 'the Law, but by the Divine Nature of Christ, 'seeing *without him men can do no good thing?* And I *Query*, Whether the Divine Nature of Christ, whereby God is known, be without the Holy Ghost, or whether the Divine Nature of Christ did not, *even then*, make perfect, for in *Truth Advanced*, p. 70. he denies *Cornelius*, &c. had the Holy Ghost, and p. 71. that the

Law

Law within made perfect, before the one Offering came to be Revealed ?] 2. 'How could 'they be excused but by Christ ? — 3. 'How 'could they be without excuse, who disobey'ed, if they had no Principle given them suf'ficient, whereby to perform their Obedience ? — 4. 'How did some of them PERFECT the 'Law, and judged the Circumcision, and was '*Jews* inwardly, and had Praise of God, if not 'by Christ ? [Could they perfect that Law that it self made nothing perfect ? Again, is the *Jew* inward, who hath praise of God by Christ without the Holy Ghost, but a Son of *Hagar* ? Surely this Man had need have looked at home and *retracted* his own *Errors*, before he had been so brisk upon others.] 5. 'How could 'they clearly see the invisible things of God, 'but by Christ the Son, seeing it is said, *None 'knows the Father but the Son, and he to whom the 'Son reveals him ?* And though these invisible 'things are clearly seen in or through the 'things that are made, yet not without that 'which is to be known of God manifest in them, 'which God had shewed unto them, which gave 'them an Eye, or Understanding to see his '*Invisible Power* and *Godhead* in these things. [And now I query, How doth the Son reveal these invisible things, but by the Holy Spirit ? 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. Do Men see the *Invisible Power* and *Godhead* without it ? Or is that Administration, that gives to see the Invisible Power and Godhead, *Evangelical* or *Legal*; *Imperfect* or *Perfecting ?* But fighting against Truth, blinds Men.]

Again he tells his Adversary, 'Thou secret-

'ly

'ly Labours to prove that the Name of *Jesus Christ*, Redeemer and Saviour, belongs only 'to the Word, as it was manifest in that particular Body and Form of Man, born of the 'Virgin *Mary*, but not to him as manifest in the 'Saints, which (saith *G. Keith*) contradicts 'the Scripture Testimony, *Ibid.* [And *G. Keith* doth the same in Effect, in representing the Word, or Law within, weak and imperfect, before that Manifestation.]

My next Citations shall be out of his *Postscript* to *G. Whitehead*'s Book stiled, *Nature of Christianity*, &c. in Answer to the same *Rob. Gordon*, Printed *Anno* 1671.

'God was in Christ, reconciling Men to him-'self EVER SINCE the fall in all Ages, both BE-'FORE and since Christ suffered in the outward, 'having given them, or put in them the Word 'of Reconciliation, by which they, who be-'came renewed thereby, were *reconciled* and *ju-'stified* IN ALL AGES. But according to *R. G.*'s 'Doctrine, no Men were justified nor reconciled, '*until Christ suffered Death in the outward*; be-'cause then, and *not till then*, was Reconcilia-'tion and Justification wrought, *&c.* p. 65. And according to *G. Keith* it is the same, except Men were reconciled and justified, by a Law that made not perfect?

Nature of Christianity, 1671.

Page 70. He reckons up *R. Gordon* his *corrupt Doctrines*, the fourth whereof is this, 'That Obedience to the Light in the Consci-'ence, is but the Work of the first Covenant, 'and Righteousness thereof, and that no Man 'is justified thereby. Query, Is not the Light in

in the Conscience, the Law within? Or is that *sound* in *G. Keith*, which is *corrupt Doctrine* in *R. Gordon*? But *G. Keith* is yet more full in asserting the Light and Grace given the *Gentiles*, to be *Saving* and *Evangelical*, even before Christ's coming in the outward, for which hear him in his Book of *Universal Grace*, Prted, *Anno* 1671.

Universal Grace, 1671.

'For the better Understanding (saith he) 'of the Matter in Hand, how that the Saving 'and Evangelical Light of Jesus Christ hath 'been communicated unto all Men, IN ALL AGES AND GENERATIONS of the World, 'we are to consider the Words of the Apostle, to 'this purpose, *There are Diversities of Operations*, saith he, *but* ONE *Spirit*. [Is that *one* Spirit, the Holy Spirit, or *another?*] *and diversity of Administrations, but one Lord*, which 'diversity of Operations and Administrations 'are reducible unto these two, the *Law* and 'the *Gospel*, or the *first* Covenant, and the *second*. Which two, as they were very distinguishable among the *Jews*, so were they also 'among the *Gentiles*. As concerning the *Jews*, 'they had *first* the Law which came by *Moses*, 'and *secondly* they had the *Grace and Truth* '*which came by Jesus Christ* [was that saving?] 'The Righteousness of the Law, and the *Righteousness of Faith*, and these two, though they 'were distinguishable, yet as they were administred of God, they were not *separated* nor '*divided*, but the Gospel LAY HID within the 'Law, as within a Vail: — And thus Christ Jesus was in the Law, and under it —— The

'Dispen-

Dispensation of the Law was as Darkness, in respect of the clear Dispensation of the Gospel, yet even in *this Darkness*, did *Jesus Christ* the true Light *shine*. And also in or among the *Gentiles* UNIVERSALLY, there was and is somewhat, which by way of Proportion doth answer unto the *Law* and *Gospel*, *first* Covenant and *second*, which was so distinctly held forth among the *Jews*: And as among the *Jews*, there was *Moses* and the *Prophets* in the *Letter*; so universally in ALL Men, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, there hath been *Moses* and the *Prophets* in Spirit, and also CHRIST? p. 8. (Compare this with *Truth Advanced*, p. 70, 71. above recited.)

To an Objection, *How it is that in the Gospel is revealed the Righteousness of God from Faith to Faith unto the Just, and also that the Wrath of God is from Heaven revealed therein against the unrighteous, seeing the* Gentiles *have not had the Gospel preached unto them all this* TIME BY PAST, *in which they have lived in their Ungodliness and Unrighteousness*, G. Keith replies. 'To this 'Paul Answers, *That which might be known of* 'God is manifest in them, *for God had shewed it* 'unto them, which is as much as to say, though 'the Gospel came not unto them *outwardly*, *by* 'the *Ministry of Man*, yet it came unto them 'inwardly, by the Ministry of God himself, because that which may be known of God, is 'manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them. So that it is manifest, that by this 'Expression, *That which may be known of God*, 'and as it is in the *Greek*, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, is 'understood the Gospel. See p. 20. 'By

'By this Manifestation of God in the *Gentiles*, (adds he) our Adversaries deny that 'the Gospel, or any Manifestation, that is of 'a SAVING Nature, is understood [to which a little lower, he thus replies] 'If it were not '*Evangelical* and the *very Gospel* it self, in an 'inward Ministration, it would quite render 'the Words of the Apostle impertinent, and 'contrary to the purpose he treats of: For '*Paul* is here shewing what the *Gospel was*, and 'what was revealed in it, both to the Just and the 'Unjust; and because the Unjust among all the '*Gentiles* and Nations, had not the Gospel outwardly administred, he shews *they had it inwardly*, God having shewed it unto them, p. 21. Doth this agree with his Asserting the Law within made nothing perfect, till the Faith of Christ, *the one Offering*, come to be revealed? Or will he say, the *very Gospel it self, in an inward Ministration*, was not *saving* and *perfecting*, before Christ was offered up in the outward?

But the foregoing he corroborates by a fourthly thus, 'This Manifestation is said to be 'that which may be known of God, which he 'had shewed unto them, therefore it is of an '*Evangelical* and *Saving* Nature. — 5*thly*. 'By 'this Manifestation, here mentioned, they did 'CLEARLY see the Invisible *Things* of *God*, even 'his ETERNAL POWER and Godhead, p. 22.

'There was a Time (saith *G. Keith*) when 'God dwelt in their [the *Gentiles*] Knowledge, whereby they knew him, through 'what he had made manifest of his Eternal Pow-

'er

'er in them, p. 24. Was *God known through the Eternal Power* made manifest in them, and the Holy Ghost *not received*? What Confusion doth he run himself into?

Descanting upon *Rom.* 1. 20. he tells us, 'By 'the *things that are made* — may be understood 'those things which are inwardly made, those 'MARVELLOUS Works of the Lord, which 'are wrought in Mens Hearts, both of Judgment 'and Mercy, through the Appearance of God, 'and the Revelation of his Almighty Arm and 'Power, in that Heavenly and Divine Princi-'ple of his own Seed, by which indeed the *In-'visible Things* of him are *clearly seen*. And un-'til a Man come to see the Lord, in the things 'that are made of him, in himself, he can ne-'ver see him, in the things that are made with-'out him; which gave occasion to many of the '*Gentile* Philosophers, to bid People, *seek God 'within themselves*, p. 26. Now I query, Are these *marvellous Works of Judgment and Mercy* wrought in Mens Hearts, and the Holy Ghost *not received?* Or is the Divine Principle of his own Seed *separable* therefrom? This is certainly to *divide Christ*. But a little lower he tells us what *this Seed is* — 'This Seed and the 'Birth thereof, by the Springing up of these 'Heavenly Powers and Vertues, can and *doth* 'truly represent the Divine Power and *God-'head*; being the express Image of God, *Ibid.* Will he, upon second thoughts, divide the *Holy Ghost* from the *Godhead*, as he must do, if Men be allowed to have the *one*, not the *other?* That the Seed, which truly represents the

the Divine Power and Godhead, should spring up in Men, and they without the Holy Ghost in the mean while? Again, By Vertue of *what Covenant* had the *Gentiles* this Priviledge? Of that which *made no: the comers thereunto perfect!* Or of that, whereby *Grace and Truth came!* And what was the Effect of this Visitation to the *Gentiles* before Christs Incarnation, where embraced would it bring them no further, than the *first Covenant*, to be Sons of *Hagar!* &c. Not to the *filial Fear, Love, and other Virtues, suitable to the Child of the New Covenant*, or free Woman? Which he of late Appropriates to *Believers in Christ Crucified*, &c. *Sarah* said of old, *The Son of this Bondwoman shall not be Heir with my Son, with Isaac*, Gen. 21. 10. And *Abraham* is commanded to *hearken to her Voice*, ver. 12. but *G. Keith* seems to think they may in *some Revolution or other*, though they *dyed* Sons of *Hagar*.

To an Objection, *How can the* Gentiles *be either rewarded or punished, seeing they have had no Law given them*, he saith, ' The Apostle Answers, ' that they had the Law *inwardly*, though not as ' the *Jews* had it, in an *outward Administration*; ' and according to *this Law*, they should be ' Judged, and Accused or Excused, according ' to their evil or well doing — they had that ' *inwardly made manifest* in them, which *God had* ' *shewed* unto them, whereby they were con- ' demned who did Evil, and *justified* who did ' Well, p. 28. [And a little lower] ' It is ' Evident, that this Inward Principle was the ' *very Principle of the Gospel* in them, in that

' *Paul*

'*Paul* saith, that *God will render to every Man* '*according to his Deeds, in the Day when God* '*shall Judge the secrets of Men by Jesus Christ*, '*according to my Gospel*, i. e. the Gospel which 'he Preached. Now if the *Gentiles* shall be 'judged *according to the Gospel*, then the *Gospel* '*behoved in some measure to be manifest* unto 'them, for no Man shall be judged according 'to that which is *not made manifest*, p. 28, 29. Query, Was this Gospel made manifest *with* or *without* the Holy Ghost? Did it *make perfect?* Is the *Law within* another or distinct thing from the *Gospel?* For he is very nice in his Distinctions, yet all will not do, his Contradictions are so thick and palpable.

'Moreover the Apostle proceedeth to shew 'how the *Gentile*, who followed not after Righ-'teousness, had attained to Righteousness, e-'ven that of FAITH, and yet the *Jews* missed 'of it, p. 36. [Is the Righteousness of Faith 'saving?]

In p. 25. 'He *desires the Reader to observe*, 'that the Grace held forth, both in this place, 'and all others aforesaid, is the very Grace 'that is *Evangelical*, being the Word of Faith, 'and the Light which is to be believed in. [And what is Evangelical, is perfecting, I hope: For I read not, that the Gospel was *weak*, though the Law was.]

My Spirit shall not always strive WITH *Man*, he renders IN Man, calling it, 'The very Salu-'tiferous Spirit of God himself which crea-'ted Man, and ALONE hath Power to *save* or '*destroy* him, p. 52. and p. 53. 'It may still be

'understood, saith he, of that inward striving of 'the Spirit of God, by which God did strive with 'them to CONVERT them, that they might 'not be destroyed, but saved. Now let me ask him, What Spirit is this *Salutiferous Spirit?* This Spirit that brings Salvation? Is it the Holy Ghost, or not? For Christ was not yet offered up in the outward? Were those *Ante-Diluvian* Times without the Holy Ghost, who obeyed that Salutiferous Spirit which strove with them? Or were the *Converts* of those Days, under no Law, *inward* or *outward*, that made perfect? What converted them then? Or what were they converted to?

G. Keith having set down the Opinion of the *Arminians* and *Papists*, goes on thus, 'We 'in Opposition to these Opinionists do aver this 'Universal Grace, to be that very Evangelical, 'Gospel and Saving Grace, and not another, 'through which it being closed with in Faith 'and Love, *Salvation is obtained*, p. 94. This he saith of the *Grace*, but of the *Law within*, both in *Jew* and *Gentile*, he of late said, it made *nothing Perfect*, until the Faith of Christ come to be revealed, *&c.* Are they two? That predicable of the *one*, which is not of the other?

Looking-Glass, 1674.

In his *Looking Glass for Protestants*, Printed, *Anno* 1674. wherein he Labours to shew the *Quakers* are the *truest Protestants*, he compares *W. Tindals* Faith with ours in several respects. His *Fourthly* is thus, 'His Faith was, that the 'Heathen once had the Spirit of God, and that '*Pharaoh*, before his Heart was hardned, had 'the Spirit of Grace, and this is OUR FAITH,

saith

ſaith *G. Keith*, p. 28. Query, Whether it be his Faith now? Who muſt either diſtinguiſh between the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Grace, and the *Holy Spirit*, and ſo make them two, which are but one; or elſe retract his ſaying, the *Gentiles* had not the Holy Ghoſt, who believed not in Chriſt crucified and raiſed again.

Now I come to his Book of *Immediate Revelation*, &c. Printed *Anno* 1668. and Reprinted with an *Appendix*, *Anno* 1676. which tells us, 'The Light reveals the *whole* Will of God '—he needs not go forth to ſeek a Law with-'out him, the Word is near in his Heart, and 'in his Mouth; and this is the Word of Faith, 'to which *Moſes* pointed the *Jews*, and *Paul* 'the *Romans*, p. 77. It ſeems then it was *one* and the *ſame* Word of Faith, which *Moſes*, who was before Chriſt came in the outward, and *Paul*, who was after his Aſcenſion, pointed to; & the *Work the ſame*, viz. it *revealed the* WHOLE *Will of God:* And ſurely what reveals the whole Will of God, doth it not enable to perform it, according to *Phil.* 2. 13. and is not that *Saving* and *Perfecting?*

Immediate Revelation, 1676.

But he Queries, 'What was this FOUNDA-'TION of the Church of God, before ever the 'Scripture was writ, before *Moſes* and the '*Prophets*, &c? Was it not Jeſus Chriſt the 'Word, which was in the Beginning? Had it A-'NY OTHER Foundation? And what *gave them* '*the Knowledge* of this Foundation, and *builded* 'them upon it, when they had no Scripture? 'And whereupon was their Faith founded? By 'the hearing of what Word did they come by

'their Faith, seeing then the Scripture was 'not writ? It was even (saith *G. Keith*) the 'Word which came from God himself, and 'taught them immediately, p. 103. I may now Query, Had the Church then a Foundation? Were they built upon it, even in *Moses* and the *Prophets* Days? And was that Foundation Jesus Christ the Word? And did they by hearing it come by Faith in Christ, before the Scripture was writ? And yet did they not receive the Holy Ghost? Could not that Law, that Command, that Word make Perfect? Had Men Faith in Christ, and could not that Faith save *in their Days? Monstrum horrendum!*

Page 105. He tells us, that *Moses falls a declaring concerning the New Covenant*, Deut. 30. *from* ver. 11, to 16. the Probation whereof he gives in the next Page, both from *Jer.* 31. 32. and *Rom.* 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. And in p. 107. thus hath it, 'The *Jews* and People of *Israel*, 'who lived in *Moses*'s Time, and were SAVED, 'it was through Faith in this Word, in this Pro-'pher, raised up in them, in their Hearts, not 'at a distance, but nigh; *the Word is nigh in thy* '*Heart*. And this is Christ in them, the Hope 'of Glory, the Mystery hid from Ages and Ge-'nerations, but was EVER made manifest in his 'Saints, but in the latter Days more clearly, '*&c.* p. 107, 108. Query, Had Men Faith in Christ, the Word? Was the Mystery *ever* made manifest in the Saints; and yet was the Law within insufficient to make perfect, till since Christ was offered up in the outward?

Having transcribed many verses in 119

Psalm

Psalm, concerning the Word, he queries, p. 109. *What Word this is, whether the Letter of the Scripture, or that Word of Faith*, Paul (*and* Moses *long before*) *spoke of*, and its effects upon *David* he tells us anon, saying, 'This quick-'ned him, this strengthned him, this comfor-'ted him, this taught him, and made him wi-'ser than his Teachers: This was as Oyl unto 'him, a Lamp unto his Feet, and a Light to his 'Paths; in this his Steps were ordered, *verse* '133. in this he worshipped, he prayed, he 'sung *Psalms*, and all his Springs were in this, 'p. 111, 112. But I query, if the Law within made nothing perfect, until the one Offering was revealed, how came *David* by his Quicknings, Strength, Comfort, Instruction, Wisdom, Light, fresh Springs, *&c*? For now we are got a step beyond proving, that the *Gentiles were savingly enlightned*, and by occasion (administred from *G. Keith*) driven to evince, out of his former Writings, that the *Patriarchs*, before Christ was born and suffered, had such a *Law within* them, as did *make* them *perfect*. Are these the Fruits of an imperfect Law, to quicken, strengthen, *&c.* or will he, who once contended, that many were *saved* and attained unto *perfect Peace and Reconciliation* with God in their Souls, now deny it to *David*, a *Jew* both *inward* and *outward*, as he must do, if the Law could not make perfect? How is he confounded! how engaged in what is and will be too hard for him!

Solomon comes next. From what he says of *Wisdom's crying at the Gates in every City*, G.

Keith queries, *Is not her crying*, &c. *the same with* Jesus Christ *his standing at the Door*, &c. p. 113. And I query, Whether to them that *opened* unto him, even during that Administration, he did not *come in* and *Sup* with them, for *6. Keith* immediately quotes *Rev.* 3. 20. to adapt it to *Solomons* saying? *2dly*, Whether such had the Holy Ghost? And *3dly*, Whether the Law within such made them perfect, in that Age?

G. Keith goes on thus, 'The Gospel was 'Preached unto *Abraham* — *Abel*, *Enoch*, *No-* 'ah, and to ALL BELIEVERS, who lived before 'Scripture was writ in a Book, and it was spo- 'ken into their Hearts by the Spirit of Jesus 'Christ, and the Saints who then lived and 'were inspired of God, *preached the Gospel*, and 'the Gospel is the *same* in all Generations, for 'it is the Everlasting Gospel, *Rev.* 4. 6. But 'now the Declarations, Discoveries, and Mani- 'festations of this one Gospel; have been many 'and different, under the Law; more darkly in 'the Time of the Prophets, more manifestly in 'the Time of the Apostles. Yet more manifest- 'ly and yet all ONE GOSPEL, and we preach 'no other, but the same Everlasting Gospel, 'which is the Power of God unto Salvation, '*Rom.* 1. 16. See p. 213. Now hence I query, Whether the Gospel Preached unto *Abraham*, *Abel*, *Enoch*, *Noah*, &c? Were the Law within *Abraham*, &c? And whether it made them perfect? *2dly*. Whether these Believers, who lived before Scripture was writ in a Book, who had that inspeaking into their Hearts by the

the *Spirit of Jesus Christ*, partook of the *Holy Spirit*, the *Spirit of Holiness*, of Adoption or Sonship; or of the Spirit of Fear and Bondage only? Were they Sons of *Hagar* or *Sarah*? Of *First* or *Second* Covenant? 3*dly*. Whether those inspired Men, who preached the Gospel, which he allows to be the same in all Generations, had ALL OF THEM the Doctrinal Knowledge and Faith of Christ Crucified, and preached it to others? And this I the rather urge, for as much as *Truth Advanced*, p. 42. he denies that *Paul* means the *Gospel is the Power of God*, simply and abstractly considered without all *Doctrine* and doctrinal *Knowledge* and Faith of Christ Crucified.

'All Saints have the same Spirit and Word 'of Prophecy in some measure, more or less, 'that the Prophets had, who ever directed Peo-'ple to the same Spirit and Word in their 'Hearts, from which they spake, that they 'might in themselves hear the same Word and 'Spirit, whereby the true Faith comes, p. 221. Is this Spirit and Word saving? Is it perfecting in *all Ages*? Can a Man hear it and obey it, and yet be without the Holy Ghost? But hear him again.

'This *second Adam* is called the *quickning* '*Spirit*, by whose quickning Vertue, the Souls 'of ALL the Holy Men and Women were made 'and kept alive unto God, as truly *before he* '*came* in the Flesh, *as after*, *for they did all eat* '*the same spiritual Meat*, &c. Which was 'Christ; yea they did eat his Flesh, and drink his

'Blood as TRULY & REALLY in measure BE-
'FORE he came in that Body of Flesh, as the
'Saints have done since, p. 227. To the same purpose he expresseth himself in p. 258. and in *Way cast up*, p. 95. and in *Rector Corrected*, p. 95. This shews what he once thought of the Holy Men and Womens Condition in those first Ages of the World, who then only placed the difference in Degree not in Kind; now will not allow more then *Gentile* Sincerity and Righteousness, where Faith in Christ crucified is not revealed, as well as that he concludes all, before Christ was visibly offered, under such an inward Law, as made not perfect? How he will reconcile such a State to that of *eating his Flesh*, and *drinking his Blood*, let him look to. In the mean while, as he queries *Truth Advanced*, p. 184. in his query, 10. 'Can any Eat the Flesh of Christ and 'drink his Blood, who have not the Faith of 'him, as he GAVE his Body of Flesh to be 'broken, and his Blood to be shed for us? So I query, Could any do thus before it was *given* or *broken?* Or had *all those Holy Men and Women* (he spoke of even now) so much as the Faith or Knowledge that it should be broken?

Way cast up, 1677.

Having offered what Citations I at present proposed out of this Book, the next that comes in course, is, *The Way Cast up*, Printed *Anno*, 1677. He there saith, '*Paul* takes notice of 'some among the Gentiles, *in the time of Hea-*'*thenism*, who were a law nnto themselves, 'and did by Nature (to wit the Divine Na-

'ture

'ture of the Word Ingrafted in them, *James* '1. or by their own Nature, restored and 'repaired by the Grace of God, as *Augustin* 'Expounded that place) the things contained 'in the Law: And such was *Socrates* among the '*Grecians*, whom *Justin Martyr* in one of his '*Apologies*, did expressly call a *Christian*, and 'classeth him with *Abraham*, &c. p. 44, 45. Several things are Remarkable here, *one*, that in the time of *Heathenism*, some Gentiles partook of the Divine Nature, which hath been oft touched upon already. 2*dly* That their Nature was *repaired* and *restored* by the Grace of God. *Qu.* Was that Grace *insufficient* or *imperfect?* Can Nature be restored or repaired by that which makes not perfect? By any thing less than God's Holy Spirit? 3*dly* That *Justin Martyr* classed such an one with *Abraham*, and calls him a Christian. 4*thly* That here he boggleth not at the appellation, in this Book, Printed *Anno.* 1677. Though he doth afterwards, *Anno.* 1694. Saying in *Truth Advanced*, p. 46. *If they were real Christians, they had some Knowledge and Faith of Christ the Messiah, as he was to come in the Flesh.* But now the Man being *altered*, no wonder that his Expressions *vary*.

'If the Saints, before Christ came outward-'ly in the Flesh, had not Eat of the Flesh of 'Christ, and Drank of his Blood, they could 'not have had Life by him, but they had 'Life by him, and therefore, *&c.* p. 95. '[Christ] hath Lived in all Saints, as well be-'fore he came in the Flesh, as to his outward

'Birth,

'Birth, as since, p. 100. Did he *Live* in them, and did they Feed on him, even *before* his outward Birth, and yet the Law within *Jew* and *Gentile*, not make perfect till *after* it?

'Though the outward coming of the Man 'Christ was deferred, according to his out-'ward Birth in the Flesh, for many Ages, yet 'from the BEGINNING this Heavenly Man, 'the promised Seed, did inwardly come into ☞ 'the Hearts of those that believed in him, and '*Bruised the Head of the Serpent*, and *destroyed* him 'that had the *Power of Death*, that is the De-'vil, the *Stronger Man entering* the House, and '*dispossessing the strong Man, and Casting him out*, 'p. 99. When the Head of the Serpent is bruised, the Power of Death (the last Enemy) destroyed, the Devil Dispossessed and cast out, and the stronger enters, Hath not the *perfect* Law, the Law which *doth make* perfect, taken place?

Again, 'Thus the Word was made Flesh, 'even *from the beginning*, and *dwelt* in us, as in 'ALL AGES, and they beheld his Glory, *&c.* 'p. 103. Is this *Indwelling*, where the *Glory is beheld*, without the Holy Ghost, or unable to perfect the Work?

Now I come to his Book Stiled, *Way to the City of God*, Printed *Anno.* 1678. where he saith, 'Even at *Mans Fall*, the Seed of the ☞ 'Woman was given, not ONLY to Bruise 'the Serpents Head, but *also* to be a *Lamb* 'or Sacrifice, to *attone* and pacify the Wrath 'of God towards Man, p. 125. Is this Bruising the Serpents Head; attonement, *&c.*

Way to City of God, 1678.

Witnes-

Witnessed, where the Holy Ghost is not received? Is not this State, a *Gospel State* beyond *Gentile Sincerity* and *Righteousness?* And where *these Effects are wrought*, doth not the Seed of the Woman make perfect?

He tells us, 'We are not *too nicely* to 'make a difference betwixt the *Influence* and 'effects of his *outward* and *inward Sufferings*, 'but to understand them in a *perfect Conjunction*, 'and that the End of his Sufferings in *both* was 'this, *viz.* 1. Both to quench and allay the 'Wrath of God.—2. to purify and Cure Men, *&c.* p. 139. Had *G. Keith* taken the Counsel he *then* gave, he would not have so depreciated the Law within, nor denied the receiving the Holy Ghost to the Conscientious Heathen, to whom the outward was not revealed, as he hath done of late.

His Book called *Rector Corrected*, Printed *Anno.* 1680. Comes next, 'There he *denies not*, 'but that some rare and singular Gifts of the 'Spirit, have been given unto some of these 'called Heathen, some whereof have Prophesied of Christ, and others uttered some Divine 'Sayings, that could proceed from no other 'Principle, but the same *Divine Spirit* that was 'in the Christians, p. 50. *Qu.* Is this *Divine Spirit* the *Holy* Spirit, the Spirit of Holiness, which these had, while to *Cornelius* he allows only a great Measure of Gentile Sincerity and Righteousness, had these a Law within them, that made perfect, which of late he will not admit, to *Jew* or *Gentile*, until Christ, the one Offering was Revealed, : For it

Rector Corrected, 1680.

it seems they had the same Spirit the Christians had. How should this be, if the Holy Spirit was Peculiar to the latter Days, to them who believed in Christ Crucified, *&c.* For that not being done, the benefits Annexed and Apropriated thereto, could not be received. Again, that these generally had so much as a belief that the *Messiah should* come, and suffer, and rise again, is what will stick hard upon him to prove, if he dare assert it, especially considering that the Disciples, who conversed with Jesus, were even after his Resurrection, so far from believing it, either *Explicitely* or *Implicitely* (a late phrase of his) that they *disbelieved* it, and it *seemed to them as idle Tales, Lu.* 24. 11. Yet if that were granted, that all these had this belief of the *Messiah* that he should come, *&c.* Yet if he will believe himself, (which he hath small cause to do, Considering his windings and twistings of late) they could not have that holy Spirit which the Christians had, that Holy Spirit being (as he saith) peculiar to believers in Christ *Crucified,* (not in Christ *to be* Crucified.)

In the same Page he quotes a saying of *Seneca,* thus, *There is a Holy Spirit in us, that Teacheth us, as we Treat him.* So here's a Heathen hath outstript *G. Keith,* by confessing to more than a great Measure of Gentile Sincerity and Righteousness, even to the Holy Spirit in the Gentiles: And that *G. Keith* may find to his Sorrow one Day.

Again, 'God gave his Holy Spirit to instruct 'them; and the Spirit in the Jews made them

'to

'to believe in Christ, as well before he was 'Born in the Flesh, as since, and therefore 'he is called the Spirit of Faith, as being the 'Author of it, in all them that believe, p. 150. Is this Consonant to his saying, (*Truth Advanced*, p. 70.) *Nor is it any where to be found, that any received that Holy Ghost, which Christ promised particularly to the Believers in him, but such only who believed in him, even Christ Crucified and Raised again?* Will he distinguish between Gods Holy Spirit, and the Holy Ghost, or make two Holy Ghosts.

He queries, 'Was not the Spirit of Christ 'in *Moses?* And Christ the Lord was that Spi-'rit, as *Paul* hath taught, p. 187. Now I query, Seeing Christ was not then offered up, whether that Spirit were the Holy Ghost or no? And also whether the Spirit made him perfect, *yea* or *nay?*

In *Truth's Defence*, Printed *Anno.* 1682. He thus hath it, 'When I say the Spirit is the 'Rule, there is no absurdness therein; for if 'we mean by theSpirit, THE HOLY GHOST 'Christ and the Holy Ghost are *never seperated* 'or divided in what they Speak or witness 'in the Souls of Men——Christ himself in Scripture is called the *second Adam*, the quickening Spirit, *the Lord is that Spirit*, p. 170 (And in p. 107. he tells us, *Paul Expounds* Deut. 30. 14. *of Christ*, and that *Clemens Alexandrinus and others of the Fathers so understood those words of* Moses) If so, the Jews by having Christ for their Rule, had the Holy Ghost for their Rule, even before he was Crucified and Rose again. This he inforceth in what follows. 'If

Truths Defence, 1682.

'If *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, had the Spirit 'to be a Rule unto them, it is no less a Rule 'unto all now, who have the SAME FAITH 'which they had, seeing the SAME SPIRIT is 'given to Believers now, which they had, 'which Spirit is one, as *Paul* hath declared: 'And it is most Rational, that as the Faith is 'one IN ALL AGES of the World, and the 'Spirit ONE, So the Principal Rule of Faith 'should be one also, p. 114. If the Spirit be one, the Faith one, the Rule one, in all Ages of the World, How came *Cornelius* not to have the Holy Ghost, when his *Prayers and Almes came up for a Memorial before God?* Or had he that one *S*pirit, Rule and Faith, which *Enoch*, *Noah* and *Abraham* had, and that one Spirit not the Holy Spirit, not the *S*pirit of Holiness, not the *S*pirit of Adoption or Sonship? Is not this to make *two?* And to the *Levites*, P. 121. He allows the *Spirit of God to the right interpreting the Scripture:* Now Christ not being yet Crucified and Raised again. I *query*, Whether that *S*pirit were something besides the Law within, which of late he hath said, made nothing Perfect.

'His Commanding them to tarry at *Jerusa-* 'lem, until they received the promise of the Fa- 'ther, which was the *S*pirit (to wit in GREA- 'TER MEASURE than formerly it was given 'unto them) did not oblige,] *&c.* p. 141. Had he kept to this distinction in his latter Writings, he would not have told of *Cornelius* and the *Gentiles*, not having the Holy Ghost, before they had Faith in Christ Crucified, *&c.*

A

A more *plentiful Effusion* of the Spirit being no part of the Controversy, but granted: But still it is the same Spirit, same Faith, same Rule, as himself once acknowledged, and was instanced even now.

In the next place (he having of late asserted, that the Law within did not make perfect, till, *&c.*) Let us hear how he here defineth perfection, 'He who is Faithful in every re-'spect to the measure of Grace which he hath 'received, is indeed a *perfect* Man, and doth 'please God, although he be not equal in his 'attainment unto others, who have more given 'them, saith *G. Keith*, p. 212. But can any one be *perfect*, by vertue of a Law that doth *not make* perfect? And if there were this deficiency, even in the Law within, during the first Covenant Administration, how could any be perfect then? And yet to shew that he abounds with Contradictions, he hath allowed it to *many*, as in above-cited *Way to the City of God*, p. 125. which I made the Title of this first Part.

And now I come to *G. Keith*'s Book of *Divine Immediate Revelation*, Printed *Anno.* 1684. which I Read not till of late, by means of his citing it, in his answer to me, of which anon. Speaking of *Cornelius*, he saith, 'Do not *Peters* 'words plainly imply, that there were many 'such good honest Men, who were acceptable to 'God through Christ, although they had not 'heard of Christ as yet outwardly Preached? See, p. 26. 27 Again, '*Cornelius* received the 'Spirit Immediately, and yet obtained it FUR-

Divine Immediate Revelation, 1684.

THER

'THER by means of *Peter*'s Preaching, p. 63. *Qu.* Was not then the *Spirit* he received before and after *Peter*'s Preaching, the same *Spirit*.

Again, 'We no where Read in all the *Scrip*-'ture, that *Noah* Preached to all Mankind 'in the Old World, but we find expressly, 'that God, by his *Spirit*, did strive in those 'Men, which most plainly sheweth that they 'had some inward teaching given them from 'the SPIRIT OF GOD, for against what did 'they *Sin*, but that Law Published by the *Spi*-'rit of God in their Hearts, seeing they had 'no written Law?—They had that inward 'Law, which as *Paul* affirmed, the other Gen-'tiles had, *Rom.* 1. See, p. 54. The word of 'God was rare in respect of its being outward-'preached, yet it was near and within, in 'the Hearts of both Jews and Gentiles, as '*Paul* did affirm, *Rom.* 10. compared with *Deut.* 30. p. 55. Whence I *Query*, What *Spi*-rit this is? What Law Published thereby? What word this that *Paul* and *Moses* *Speak* of? And whether they that received it and obeyed it received the Holy *Spirit*, and were thereby made perfect, especially seeing he fur-ther saith, p. 79. 'All the Faithful under the 'Old Covenant were immediatly taught of 'God, yet not by vertue of the Old Cove-'nant, but of the New, which New Covenant 'in some degree had place in the time of the 'Old, and was to be further revealed in Gospel 'Daies, *&c.* Surely if the New Covenant had place in some degree, in the time of the

Old

Old, the New Testament promised (*I will put my Spirit within you*, Ezek. 36. 27.) had also a place during the Old Covenant Administration, even where the word of Faith was closed with: And what Spirit is this, if not the Holy Spirit?

In p. 55. After having defended *R. B*'s sense, with respect to *God, his never changing his way or manner of Teaching and Enlightning his People by his Spirit inwardly working in them, and his Continuing the same in all Ages, before the Law, after the Law, and also after the coming of Christ*, he adds, p. 56. that, 'The inward Preaching, Speaking and Illumination of God, by his Spirit, did ALWAYS remain in some degree, more or less, in the true Church, and in ALL its Members. [*Qu.* Were the Gentiles, who did by nature the things Contained in the Law, none of these?] For if at any time the outward Preaching was little or none,—God did supply that outward defect inwardly by his Spirit, *&c.*

In the same Book (*viz.* That part which is in answer to *Geo. Hicks*) he alledgeth, p. 154. *Clemens Alexandrinus* is so far from thinking that only the Prophets and Apostles writ by divine Inspiration, that he plainly declareth, that not only *Plato*, but also many others Preached and Declared the only true God by his Inspiration, And in p. 158. 'That *Justin Martyr* expressly saith, 'That the innate Word or Reason, declared of *James* 1. 21. Was in the *Philosophers*, *Poets* and *Historiographers*, who by the impulse thereof, spoke

'some things excellently. And they who live 'with, or according to the Word, are Christians, as among the *Grecians*, *Socrates*, *Heraclitus*, &c. But I query, How could that be, if the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ (without which none are his, *Rom.* 8. 9.) be given to none but Believers in Christ Crucified, *&c.* Or that the Law within, both Jews and Gentiles, made nothing perfect till the one offering came to be revealed? Yet that he may appear, as he is, Contradictory in every Branch, in the following Page, he bids us, 'Note, That whereas *Justin Martyr* called '*Socrates* and others, who lived in Conformity 'to the Divine Word in them, Christians, 'it is to be understood in part, according to 'that General Revelation, although we find 'not, that *Socrates* had the knowledge of Christ 'as he was to come in the Flesh, and suffer 'Death, *&c.* Now compare this with what himself hath said, *Truth Advanced*, p. 46. upon this very assertion of *Justin Martyr*'s, viz. 'If they were real Christians, and were worthy of that Honourable Name, they had some 'Faith and Knowledge of Christ the *Messiah* '&c. As he was to come in the Flesh, *&c.* So one while this wavering Man restricts Christianity to a belief in Christ come, Crucified and Raised again, and allows the appellation to *Socrates* and the rest, only upon Condition that they so knew and believed in Christ, another while admits them to be Christians in part, conform to the Divine Word, while supposeth them not to have had that Knowledge

ledge. Yet whether Men who live in Conformity to the Divine Word, can be said to be wholly Strangers to the Holy Spirit, himself will do well to consider.

In his *Plain Short Catechism*, Printed *Anno.* 1690. He saith by way of *Question* and *Answer*, Qu. 'Is the Seed or Principle of the 'second or New Covenant, after some man- 'ner, in all Men? A Yea, *Qu.* And is that 'Seed or Principle, Christ the Word of Faith? 'A Yea, p. 9. Now *I Query*, Whether Christ the Word of Faith, the Seed or Principle of the New Covenant, in all Men, were always *saving* and *perfecting* IN ALL MEN, where embraced? Or since Christs Ascension only? *Catechism, 1690.*

He queries again, '*Q.* Is that great Mystery 'greatly (I suppose it should be, generally) 'revealed in all? A Nay, *Q.* Did not God 'reserve the more full Revelation of it, in a '*more general* way, to the time after Christ 'should suffer Death for Mens Sins, and rise 'again? A Yea, Q. Was not therefore Christ 'the Mystery hid from Ages and Generations, 'until the fulness of time, and that both as to 'his inward and outward coming, *for most* '*part*? A Yea, ibid. By these words [more full Revelation, more general way, for most part] he seems to allow the Mystery was not hid from all. Now I query, Whether they, to whom the Mystery was revealed before Christ suffered Death for Mens Sins, were under the Law within that made nothing perfect, according to *Truth Advanced*, p. 71. Or

were of the Many who were saved, and attained unto perfect Peace and Reconciliation with God in their Souls, according to *Way to City of God*, p. 125. Or whether he will undertake to reconcile those two Passages.

Hitherto I have opposed his former to his latter writings, now let us see, whether in *one* and the *same Book*, he be not as Contradictory to himself, and that in his *Truth Advanced*, Printed *Anno* 1694. as a kind of System of *G. Keith*'s Divinity. He asks, ' Who can ' say with understanding, that *Moses*, *Samuel*, ' *David* and the *Prophets*, and *John* that came ' after, were not in that Kingdom, as well as ' *any now*, for they had the SAME Righteonsness, Peace and Joy in the HOLY GHOST, ' as any now have; and therefore, if by the ' Kingdom, we understand Christs Kingdom ' of Grace in the Hearts of true Believers, ' surely *John*, and all the holy Prophets, and ' other Holy Men and Women were in it, as ' well *before* Christ came in Flesh, as *since*, &c. And a little lower, ' All this doth not in the ' least infer, that the Prophets were not true ' Believers in Christ, as well as any now, and ' had not by true Faith an entrance into Gods ' Kingdom, as well as any now; for it is absurd to suppose with the *Papists*, that when ' they dyed, they went into a Certain *Limbus* ' or Prison, where they were detained, and ' had not an entrance into God's Kingdom, ' until Christ rose from the Dead: And it is ' as absurd for any to Imagin, that Believers ' generally, since Christ came in the Flesh ' after

Truth Advanced, 1694.

'after Death, have a *greater* or *higher* place,
'or are greater in the Kingdom of Glory,
'that is to come, than the prophets have, for
'it is most clear from Scripture, that *Abra-*
'*ham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, and all the Prophets
'are in that Kingdom of God, *Luke* 13, 28 29.
'And none can enter into the Kingdom of
'God hereafter, who have not known some
'beginning of entrance in to it here, in this
'World, See p. 136, 137. This affords much matter to comment on, and compare with what he hath delivered elsewhere, particularly in this very Book. 1. *Moses*, the *Prophets* and *John* were in the Kingdom, had Righteousness, Joy and Peace in the *Holy Ghost*, as well as any now: They and *other* Holy Men and Women were in the Kingdom of Grace, as well *before* Christ came in the Flesh, as *since*. How can that be? If Christ promised the Holy Ghost PARTICULARLY to Believers in him, to such ONLY who believed in him, even Christ Crucified and Raised again, as he asserts, p. 70. Could these Holy Men and Women believe in Christ Crucified and Raised again, *before he was so?* If not, How came they by that Gift, which was annexed to such qualifications, as they could not have? 2. They were not detained in a *Limbus* or Prison; it is an absurdity in the *Papists* to suppose so, or that they had not an entrance into God's Kingdom, until Christ rose from the Dead, with he here. But in p. 71. that the Law within made nothing perfect, until the Faith of Christ, the one offering come to be revea-

led, by which one offering he hath forever perfected, *&c.* Is an entrance then administred into the Kingdom of Grace, by a Law that doth not make perfect? Or can Men have that *before* the one offering, which perfects, be Revealed, which is only to be had by the Revelation of that one offering? 3. Whereas he asserts now, that none can enter into th Kingdom of God hereafter, who have no known some beginning of entrance in this World, *I ask*, Can they enter by an imperfect Law? It is hard for Man to come up to the height of the Ability given, but can any advance higher? If the Law be *weak*, are no they *weaker?* Again, if Men must know som beginning of entrance here, then those Conscientious Gentiles, such as *Cornelius* was be fore *Peter* Preached to him, either *had* it her (and can that be without the Holy Ghost? or they *must have* it there. If they have not, but must have it, when shall that be, a renewed Visitation, in some other Revol tion, or in Purgatory? A Medium let hi find, if he can: And so I follow him to t second Head.

2. *Absurdities and Contradictions Promiscuo Collected.*

I now come to make my Observations some *Absurdities* and *Contradictions* interwo by way of *Miscellany*, as I find them occu his late large Tract, entituled, *Truth Ad ced*, in which (as in the foregoing)

keep to the order of the Pages, for the most part.

'Some (he saith) expound the Herbs and 'Trees, given to Man for Food before the 'Fall, to be paradisical, *Gen.* 1. 29. And the 'Earth paradisical, distinct from this Gross 'visible Earth, called the *Dry Land*, [and adds] 'So it will be to the raised Saints, at 'the Resurrection of the Dead, who shall live 'and dwell in that Garden, where *Adam* and '*Eve* at first was placed, called *The New Earth*, 'Rev. 20. And though they shall have the 'Command and Rule of this *Visible Earth*, 'under Christ their Head, yet they shall need 'nothing in it, p. 24. By this it should seem, that this *Visible Earth* is to remain, though the Saints need nothing in it: Then not to be *Burnt up* and *dissolved*, with the *Works that are therein*, according to 2 *Pet.* 3. 10, 11. for what is burnt up and is dissolved, is no more Visible.

From an unproved assertion that, 'The Bo-'dy of Man had not this Grosness and Imper-'fection before the Fall [he draws this Inference, that] 'It is manifest, that the manner 'of Mans Generation or Propagation had been 'after a far more Excellent manner, than now 'it is, if the Fall had not been, p. 27. 28. But that is not *Manifest*, though he, *Dictator* like, saith it is; but needeth Proof.

'It is certainly a great and hurtful Error for 'any to hold, that the outward and Visible 'Earth was not cursed for Mans sake, saith he, p. 32. Then I hope the Contrary is true,

that the *Earth was Cursed for Mans sake*, But why, I pray? If 'Man before the Fall was not 'made of the common Dust, but much more 'pure and Refined, than that which of which 'Mens Bodies were made since the Fall, as he tells us, p. 21. and also p. 117. and that 'Paradice, where God placed Man, was no 'part of this Visible Earth, p. 16. Must the Earth suffer for what Man did in Paradi[illegible] when neither his Creation was out of *her* but of a *more pure and Refined Dust*, nor his Sin committed in her? How could it affect her then? Is it equal she should suffer for what was done elsewhere, by one that had not his [illegible]ice out of her? Surely if his Notion were true, the Garden where he Trespassed, and out of the Dust whereof he was made, were more likely to be affected with *Adams* Sin, than this Visible Earth: For Gods way is equal, *Ezek.* 18. 25.

'No Illumination (he saith) is able to save 'fully and perfectly with Eternal Salvation, 'but that which gives the Knowledge and 'Faith of Christ Crucified and Raised again, 'p. 40. Then those *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who dyed without it, either shall not be saved with eternal Salvation, or it must be revealed hereafter, according to the Doctrine of the Revolutionists: The latter seems to be his, by his supposing, 'A middle state for some 'time only, until the Faith of Christ be re-'vealed unto these Souls, p. 44.

In p. 97. he thus hath it, 'Both Christ's 'Resurrection Body, and the Resurrection

Bodys

'Bodies of the Saints at their appearance, ſhall
'have no heavineſs nor weight to encline them
'to the Globe of the Earth, as Chriſts Body
'Now in Heaven hath none—And in p. 98.
'They ſhall appear in ſome certain place a-
'bove the Globe of the Earth, over or above
'the Mount of *Olives*, where Chriſt aſcended
'after he roſe from the Dead. And though
'the Reſurrection Body of a Saint, cannot
'be in all places at once, yet without doubt
'they can move from one place to another, at
'any diſtance, upwards or downwards, South,
'North, Eaſt or Weſt, in the twinckling of
'an Eye, or according to the ſwiftneſs of a
'Thought, which is eaſy to underſtand, and
'ſuch who know, that ſome of the Moveable
'Stars and Luminaries move ſome hundreds of
'Miles in leſs than one Minute of time, ſome
'of which are greater Bodies than the Globe
'of the the Earth. This Notion he would
do well to Evince by *plain Evidence of Holy Scriptures*, and *in Scripture Words and Terms*, ſeeing he ſaith, *it is only ſafe to keep* thereto, P. 118. As ſuch I leave it with him, and proceed.

'When their Reſurrection Bodies ſhall be
'given unto them, then their *inner* white Gar-
'ments ſhall be Cloathed upon, as with an
'*outward* Garment, even as when a man that
'is Cloathed with a fine Linnen Shirt or Waſ-
'coat, putteth on another fine Garment above
'it, to which the words of *Paul* are to be
'referred, 2 *Cor.* 5.1,2,3,4. See p. 101. And in the next Page, as if he were proud of his

Compa-

Comparison, he goes on and tells us, 'I shall 'not enlarge at present, nor further launch 'forth into THESE MYSTERIES, although 'I may safely say, more of these things have 'been in Part opened unto me, than I think fit 'to declare, or can declare in Words, p. 102. Which, if they be no better than his *Wastcoat Mysteries*, he may even keep them to himself, and make the best of them: For he is a Strange Man at Similes. Yet he will be kind for rather than Men shall want cloaths at the Resurrection, he hath provided them an upper and under Garment, a *Shirt or Wastcoat, and a fine Garment above it*: So that they shall be doubly cloathed, which is more than his Text allows him.

As in p. 27. he had interpreted the *Coats of Skins, wherewith God cloathed* Adam *and* Eve *after the Fall, to be a cloathing the Soul with the Righteousness of the Lamb, and the Body with the Skin and Flesh of this frail, mortal and corruptible Body* (on which I made my Observations in my last Book, called, *People called Quakers cleared*, &c. p. 45.) now he improveth it thus, 'Within this *brutal* Skin of the gross Body 'that rotteth in the Grave, there is lodged 'the true Body of Man, that corrupteth not, 'and the gross Skin or visible Part is no essen-'tial Part of the true Body, more then Dross 'is a Part of the Silver or Gold — but at the 'Resurrection of the Dead, nothing of the 'Drossy Part, that is brutal, shall arise, but 'only that which is proper to Man as Man, to 'wit, such as *Adam* had before the fall. So

'the

the Flesh that is gross, mortal and corrup-
tible, is not that Flesh, that shall be raised up
immortal and incorruptible, p. 113. This
not only contradicts his own saying (*Testimony against that absur'd Opinion*, p. 3.) 'That
which riseth is the MORTAL, that putteth
on immortality, and the corruptible which
putteth on incorruption, but even the Apo-
le *Paul*, for he saith, *this mortal shall put on immortality*, 1 Cor. 15. 54. Now from what I have quoted above, I demand proof of him. *First*, That the frail, mortal and corruptible Body, which *Adam* had after the Fall, was not the Body he had before the Fall. *Secondly*, That the Body he had after the Fall riseth not, but that which he had before the Fall; for we must not take things upon trust from so unstable an Author.

In p. 115. he tells his Reader, where the 'Separation is made between the *pure* and *no-*
'*ble* Part, and that *drossy* Part in Mans Body [*viz.*] 'In the Mystical and Invisible *Machpe-*
'*lah*, or Sepulchre in *Hebron*, in the Land of '*Israel*, figuratively and mystically understood [and who it is to be] 'bought of, *viz.* Of '*Ephron* the *Dust-Eater*, [and at what price, *viz.*] '400. pieces of Silver, *i. e.* by so ma-
'ny Vertues [and adds in the next Page] 'that in the mystical Land of *Israel*, all the dead 'Bodies of the Saints shall be raised up, and 'stand with the Lamb upon Mount *Zion*, to 'wit, not the *literal Zion*, but the *Mystical* [But foreseeing an Objection, *viz.*] '*How can* '*these* 400. *pieces of Silver* (*signifying so many*
'*Ver-*

'*Vertues, be paid to* Ephron *the* Duſt-Eater, '
'Ephron *be the Devil*, &c. [to this he very gravely Anſwers] 'Things ſpoken by way of 'Allegory, and Parable are not ſtrictly to be 'underſtood in every Circumſtance. This is like himſelf, *Dictator-like*, when he pleaſes they ſhall; when otherwiſe they ſhall not be underſtood in every Circumſtance: His Word muſt be a Law, elſe he will wrangle. Nay in this very Place he will not bate an Ace of 400. Vertues, they muſt be juſt ſo many, 'the num-'ber 400. being (as he ſaith) produced of 'four, Anſwer to the four elemental Principles 'or Qualities of the Body, and the number 10. 'to the ten Commandments, and that again 'multiplied by other ten, becauſe every one of 'the ten Commandments may be well under-'ſtood to be branched forth into other ten. This is to *impoſe* not *argue*. If this be the Fruit of his being *further enlightned*, as he boaſts (*Advertiſement*, p. 4.) I may ſafely ſay, ſurely the *old is better*, Luke 5. 39. what he learnt, when little and low, beyond theſe tow'ring Imaginations. But what Reaſon, I pray, ſave that *G. Keith* ſaith it, is there for ſtraining the Allegory in one place, not in the other? Or why might not another multiply them by ten more, and ſo make 4000. of them?

Again, he ſaith, 'The Graves that ſhall be 'opened at the Reſurrection of the Dead, are 'not any viſible Places on this Globe of the 'Earth [How will he prove that? I am ſure his Friends he would now creep in with, are of another Mind] 'but certain inviſible places to

'our

"our carnal Eyes —— commonly (adds he) "Men have two Graves, the first given them "by Men, until the Separation be made betwixt "the *Kirnel* and the *Drossy Part*, by Putrefaction (as suppose after a Year, or more or less) "the second given them by God, who probably "may use the Ministry of Angels therein. See *Jude* 9. saith he, p. 116, 117. Query, What becomes of the Body, after a Year or more, when the Separation is made betwixt the Kirnel and Drossie Part? And what becomes of the Kirnel? Where is it bestowed till the Day of Judgment? Or to use his own Words, is only Belly, Guts, and Draught left behind?

He goes on, 'What is said of the Drossy "Part belonging to Mens Bodies, called by *Paul*, "*Corruption*, is no wise to be understood of the "Body of Christ, which had no such part in "it, but was altogether most Pure, and saw no "Corruption, and therefore when the Sepulchre was looked into, nothing was there to be "found, but the Grave-cloaths, p. 117. From hence I observe, that the additional Cloathing which he makes Man to have received after the Fall, that which was not proper to Man as Man, *viz.* the Skin and Flesh of this frail, mortal, and corruptible Body, Christ partook of and ascended with (nothing was to be found in the Sepulchre, but the Grave cloaths) yet his Flesh not corrupt: But we leave that cloathing behind us, a Separation being made betwixt the Kirnel and the Drossy Part: How then shall our vile Bodies be changed, and fashioned like his glorious Body (according

ing

ing to *Phil.* 3. 21.) if we rise only with wh
is proper to Man as Man, and which *Ad*
had before the Fall, and Christ taketh both
Is that (which he in us terms the brutal Par
so necessary an Appendix to Christs Body, a
not so to ours? Or are our vile Bodies, inste
of being fashioned like his glorious Body, le
behind unchanged? This 'tis to over-value
Mans self upon *School Philosophy*, and neglect
better Teacher: And I bring it, not as declar
tive of my own Faith either way, but as *Ar*
mentum ad hominem, against *G. Keith.*

'That the Body of Man before the Fall (
which he compares the Resurrection Bodie
'were not made of this visible Earth, but
'that Dust *whereof is Gold, and the Stones of*
'*Sapphires*, Job 28. 6. compared with *Re*
'21. 21. is another of his *unproved* Assertio
Ibid. And yet p. 118. summing up his Ma
ter, he saith, 'But against the Doctrine of t
'Resurrection, as here delivered and open
'by plain Evidence of Holy Scripture, and
'Scripture Words and Terms, to which it
'ONLY safe in this and in all other things,
'keep close, some will be ready to Obje
Answ. Who these *Objecters* are, he hath not d
clared, nor perhaps can. We have been
far from so Objecting, that we have still ke
to it our selves, and rejected the contrary
particularly in this very Controversie of the R
surrection. And I am willing to join issue wi
him here, touching these very Notions he ha
so lately Broacht. Let him then give *plain e*
dence from Scripture, and in Scripture Words a
Ter

Terms, that God cloathed Man, *after the Fall*, with the Skin and Flesh of this frail, mortal and corruptible Body; that there is a twofold Grave, one given by Man, the other given by God who may therein use the Ministry of Angels; that it is to be bought of the *Dust-Eater*, the Devil, and the purchase 400 Vertues, answering to the four Elemental Principles, and the ten Commandments brancht forth into other ten; that Man was not made of the common Dust of this visible Earth; and that the Resurrection—Bodies were to be made of the same. He that is so tart upon others, let us see how he will come off himself; for I demand *Chapter* and *Verse* for these Assertions of his. More I could instance in, but these lye next.

As he had said, p. 27. 'It is not to be questioned, but the true Body of Man lieth within the Shell, Oar or Mine of this gross, heavy and corruptible Body, and that is it which shall be the Resurrection Body, at the Resurrection of the Dead. So now he saith, 'Though Man-Eaters may eat the gross Part of 'Mans Body, yet that more subtile and invisible Part, they cannot, nor can that which belongs to one be given to another: hence by 'way of Allegory and Metaphor, it is called '*Bone* in Scripture, *Isa.* 66. 14. See p. 119. Query, What is that *gross* part, the Man-Eaters may eat? Is it only the *Belly, Cats and Draught*, which p. 111. he tells us, *Paul* distinguisheth from the Body, saying, *God will destroy the Belly*, but he doth not say he *will destroy the Body*? And what is the more *subtile* and *invisible* Part?

Is

Is it that very Numerical Body that dyeth (without Belly, Guts and Draught) which he saith elsewhere, Man was cloathed with *after* the Fall. Or is it that Body, which he pretends is proper to Man as Man, and received *before* the Fall? Again, What is that Bone, he speaks of? Is it the Bone LUZ, he hath talkt of? Or what is it? If he will needs set up for a *new Sect*, between the received Opinion of the same Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones rising, and our sticking to Scripture Words, that *it is sown a natural Body, raised a spiritual Body*, let him explain his terms.

Now let us hear him upon a new Subject, having treated from p. 122. of the *new Heaven and new Earth*, promised to the Saints, in p. 124. he saith, 'This new Earth is called *Prov.* '8. 26. *The highest Part* (Heb. *Head*) *of the* '*Dusts of the World*. And *Isa.* 58. *The high places* '*of the Earth*. All which (he tells us) cannot 'be understood of any *visible* places of the Earth [Why so? Because *G. Keith* saith it?] 'And 'that it is called, *Prov.* 8. *The Head of the Dusts of* '*the World*, doth plainly Point at the *Excellency* 'of it, for as Man is called in Scripture the *little* '*World*, and the *whole Creature*, so the World 'may be called, and is so called by some, a '*great Man*. Now though the lower Parts of 'this *great Man* (i. e. the *World*) are visible 'to our carnal Eyes, yet the *Head* or *chief* '*Part* of it is invisible to us, and will be until 'we attain to our Resurrection Bodies, but 'with Eyes suitable to our Resurrection Bodies, 'we shall both see it, and find our selves in

'is,

'it, *&c.* See p. 124, 125. [And then tells us] 'That in Scripture the Word Land or Earth '— hath a Reference to a certain Place or Re-'gion, above the Globe of this visible Earth, 'whither the Body of Christ is ascended, and 'whither the Bodies of the raised Saints, at 'the Resurrection of the Dead shall ascend, '*&c.* *Answ.* That *Prov.* 8. and *Isa.* 58. speak of the *new Heavens*, and the *new Earth*, he would enforce, *Ibid.* from the Terms *high* and *highest Part of the Earth*, alledging the *visible Mountains are but like Moles in a Face*, and from the *Excellency of it*. But what of all that? The Hills are the highest places in respect of the Valleys, and a Mole in a Mans Face, is a rising there, and higher than the rest? as well as that one part of the Earth *excells* another. Was not *Canaan, the Land he had espied for* Israel, *the Glory of all Lands*, Ezek. 20. 6. Or is there no transcendency, no excellency to be allowed to *one* part of the *visible Creation* before *another*, but we must needs confound it with the new Earth? Again I observe that, with him, This *new Earth* is part of the *old* Earth, the *lower Parts* of this great Man (the World) are *visible*; the other, the *Head* or *Chief* Part, *invisible*. Whence will he pretend to deduce his Proof hereof, *viz.* That the *new* Earth was part of the *old?* Will he do it by plain evidence of Holy Scripture, and in Scripture Words and Terms, to which he said in p. 118. it is only safe to keep? Or will he dig into the *Ditch* of that *called Philosophy* (a Phrase of his own) to make it out? And whereas he tells

us, that the *Word Land or Earth in Scripture hath reference to a certain Place or Region, above the Globe of this visible Earth, whither Christ is ascended, and the Saints Bodies shall ascend*, why doth he not give his Reader *Chapter* and *Verse*, where it is so said, that he may see whither cogent or aptly applied, or no?

From p. 125. to p. 127. he infers the long Life of those within the *Millenium*, or thousand Years, from *Isa.* 65. 20, 21, 22. saying p. 126. 'The Age of Men shall be exceedingly prolonged beyond what it is now, even as it was in that Time before the Flood [Again] Whereas it is promised, *As are the Days of a Tree, so are the Days of my People*, I do well remember, that *Justin Martyr*, in his Dialogue with *Tryphon* the *Jew*, saith, 'That they should be read, As are the Days of the *Tree of Life*, so are the Days of my People, which do relate to *Adams* Paradisical Estate before the Fall (saith *G. Keith*) for if *Adam* had not sinned, he had never dyed the Bodily Death, *&c.* p. 127. What is this but to confound *long Life* with *Eternity*, and that out of the same Text? Especially considering, that in that very verse it is said, *They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not eat, and another plant; for as the days of a Tree, are the days of my People*, Isa. 65. 22. Doth he think what they *built* and *planted* while here, they should *inhabit* in, and *eat* of hereafter?

Looking back upon p. 126. towards the bottom, I find this Passage, *viz.* 'The raised Saints shall need neither Candle nor Light of

'the

the Sun, even to their bodily Eyes, as *Adam*, before his Fall needed no Light of the Candle, or of the Sun, *&c.* *Answ.* This *gratis dictum* that *Adam*, before the Fall, eeded not either Light of the Candle or Sun, or have we *plain Evidence of Holy Scripture for* , or so much as *Scripture Words or Terms*, hich he, even now, said *it is only safe to keep* . That the raised Saints, as to *their bodily yes*, shall not need it, is *ejusdem farinæ*; for is the *Sight*, so the *Object*: And it is not to questioned, but they shall be in as good a ondition, as ever *Adam* was before the Fall, d may be inferred that their Opticks, if the me (which lies upon him to prove) will be as netrating, as ever his were, before he fell.

To an Objection, That 'As the *Manna* was not to be gathered on the *Sabbath-day*, &c. o in the Time of the 1000 Years, or *great abbath* — there is no possibility of Conversion to any, who have not been formerly converted [he Answers] It doth well enough rove, that there is no possibility of Conversion to any, who have formerly lived in the World, and neglected their Time of Grace nd Salvation, which they once had — it is ain for any such to expect to live again, and ave another Time of Grace and Salvation, ut it doth not in the least prove that any uch, who have not at any Time formerly ived in the World, shall not have a Time of Grace, *&c.* This I bring as an Instance of his ning to the Notion of the Revolutionists, hich he cares not *publickly* to own: But if he

did not believe Men might come into th World again, he might have said so, *in Terms*, and have answered the *Objection* directly without any Circumlocution. Nay he betrayeth what he had in reserve, in what follows where speaking of such as *have been prevented from having the outward means of Salvation offered*, he adds, that God 'doth well know to supply what is wanting to any Part of Mankind 'in such Ways and Methods, and by such 'means as Men cannot comprehend. Now having been *positive* in p. 44. *That Eternal Life and Salvation is* ONLY *to be had through the Faith and Knowledge of Christ crucified*, &c. must mean by [supply what is wanting] some Visitation or Means of imparting that Faith, though the *Modus*, or Manner of doing it is not expresst, which must be *here* by a renewed Visitation, and then it favours the Conceit of the *Revolutionists*; or hereafter, and then it more than borders upon that of *Purgatory*.

To his Notion, p. 152. of an *outward and visible Antichrist, yet to come, who shall call himself the Christ and* Messiah, *and deceive many false Christians and Jews*. I Reply, He had better look at home, for there Antichrist already sitteth and reigneth, even where Christ has spare; and the House which was once swept and garnished, is the unclean Spirit entered with other worse.

His alledging, that 'None are truly and 'properly Christians, but who are anointed 'with some measure of that Heavenly *Anointing* of the Holy Spirit, that cometh from

'Chri

Christ, which none receive but through the Faith of Christ crucified and raised again, p. 167. I oppose to his saying, *Appendix* to *Immediate Revelation*, p. 243. that *true Religon and* Christianity *may subsist without the History of Christ in the Letter*, having already made my Remarks thereon elsewhere.

The next thing before me, is where he saith, We do not find, that God saw the second Days Work to be good, but it is said of all the rest, *God saw that it was good*, which may Mystically signifie unto us, the great Degeneration of Mankind in the second Age, p. 172. *Answ.* I thought all Gods Works had been good, the *second* as well as the *seventh*. Is he of another Mind? *Gen.* 1. 31. tells us, *God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good*, and adds, *and the Evening and the Morning were the Sixth Day*. So that *very good* is ascribed to the *Six*, which were in being, and among them the *second* was one, not to the seventh for that was *not yet* in being, nor mentioned in that Chapter. Is it not enough for him to be self-inconsistent, but he must endeavour to render the *great Creator* so too? Which must be, if he saw *every thing* that he had made to be very good, and had not seen the *second Days Work* to be so?

Well had it been for him, he could have taken the Counsel he is so ready to give, *viz.* "Let none be hasty to embrace or reject any "thing or things, that Men may bring forth "as Openings or Discoveries of Divine Truth, "beyond what is at present commonly made

'known; for *Satan* is not wanting to tran
'form himself; as if he were an *Angel of Lig*
'and will be apt to intrude his Diabolical Su
'gestions and Devilish Doctrines, as if the
'were Divine Revelations, p. 159. Of wh
kind his are, they that walk in the Light, d
abundantly see and perceive, not without gri
on his behalf; which that others also may se
and avoid the snare he warns of, while he mis
rably plungeth himself into it, are these expose

Thus Reader, hast thou presented unto the
es in a mirror or short Extract, some more
G. Keith his *Contradictions* and *Absurdities*,
promised in the Title, for thee to consid
from what *Fountain* they sprang, seeing the A
postle *James* saith, *Doth a Fountain send for*
at the same place, sweet and bitter, Chap. 3. ve
11. And now I shall consider his late Book, i
Answer to Mine, called, *The People called* Qu
kers *cleared by* G. Keith, *from the false D*
trines charged upon them by G. Keith, *&c*
wherein I had compared some of his *Contrad*
tions together.

3. *Reply to* G. Keith's *Book, Entituled*, Anti
christs and Sadducees detected, *&c.*

Antichrists and Sadducees detected.

While I was Revising *G. Keith*'s Books, an
digesting the Quotations for a further Servic
that might offer, knowing I had to do with
restless Adversary, who for all his pretences t
want of *Time and Ability of outward Estate*
was uneasy under our Defences, out comes a
Advertisement (in a news Paper called *Pegasu*
Numb. 14.) subscribed, *G. Keith*, wherei
h

he declares himself *greatly injured, and badly and unjustly reflected on*, in my Book entituled, *People called* Quakers *cleared*, &c. and *gives notice* that *after our Answer to his late Narrative* (which he *supposes*, and might well suppose we would Answer) *he purposeth, God willing, to intimate another Meeting* (*with leave of Authority*) *at* Turners-Hall, *to Answer the Book, and detect* (as he saith) *the several gross Perversions and abusive Wrestings therein.* But like a Man, that never knows how to hold long of one Mind, he at length puts it upon another (tho' indeed more *proper*) issue, where I now meet him.

His Book, as by *Title Page*, is divided into three Parts, 1. An Answer to *Caleb Pusey*. 2. To me. 3. Postscript to the Pious and Learned in the Church of *England*, and among other Protestant Dissenters. I shall a little invert the Order, and begin with what affects my self, it being Relative to what precedes above, where having placed my Quotations according to their Dates and Pages, and the Title Pages of the Books in the Margin, the Reader may more easily recurr to them, when referred to in what follows.

He begins with me, p. 21. and entitules that part, *Some Remarks upon* J. Penington's *late Book, Entituled*, The People called *Quakers* cleared, *&c. And* G. Whitehead *his Postscript, shewing some of their gross Perversions, falshoods and groundless Calumnies against* G. Keith. *Page 21.*

The Charge is high, now let us see how the Proof will answer. To my saying, that to the Meeting he appointed (at *Turners Hall*)

our Consent was neither sought nor made necessary, he answers, *They got timely notice, a Month before hand, and were desired to be present.* Ans. That proves not, that our *Consent was either sought or made necessary*, for upon the Publication of his Summons he leaves no room for that, but declares his full Intention to be there, and make good his Charge, whether we come or no (see *Advertisement*, p. 2.) nor doth his *desiring us in former Prints, to consent to Time and Place*, as alledged by him, evince that THIS Meeting was not appointed without our Consent sought or made necessary. What the Reasons of our refusal to meet him were, hath been already made publick, even by my self in my REFLECTIONS upon his *Advertisment*, whereto I referr, and proceed.

To my telling him (he saith *their*, in the Plural, as if he scorned to engage me single) that two Books lye upon him unanswered, to which he gave grounds to expect an Answer, he saith, *First, Some of their own Church have sufficiently answered to shew the badness of their Cause, in that censure they gave against* T. Ellwood, *&c.* If this were true, that some had done so, for they are *nameless*, and at most give but their own Censure, and that but to a Passage or two, have they answered the Book in Print? Or if they had, would that excuse *G. Keith?* How willing is he to *shift*, when pinched, and to *lay hold of any Twig, like a drowning Man* (a Comparison he once used) to evade making good his Charge! But he hath a *Secondly*, viz. that *he hath offered to Answer them* Viva voce,

voce, *at a Meeting*, alledging *there is no end of answering them in Print*, that *few will be at the Pains to compare Book with Book*, and that *the Charge is too great for him*. But why did he begin then with Printing, and not rather have exhibited his Charge at first *Vivâ voce*, if he esteemed that the best Method of Debate? But to do it now when he hath drawn us into the Press, and to expect we should do so too, is preposterous. Nay, why doth he now answer me in Print, seeing so few will be at the pains of comparing Book with Book, *&c.* as he alledgeth, and that he so lately proposed a *Vivâ voce*, vindicating himself against me, in his *winged* ADVERTISEMENT tagg'd to the Tail of *Pegasus*, but that he is so hampered with a bad cause, that he knows not which way to turn?

My Quotations, in the Book he now pretends to Answer, were 1. His vindicating our Principles from our common Adversaries. 2. His Contradictions in several Doctrinal Parts. To the first, he Answers, *Such as I did think were their Principles, I did formerly vindicate*. Nay, this will not shelter him, it was such as he KNEW to be so, and that from twenty eight Years Converse both Publick and Private, with the most Noted and Esteemed among them, in many Places of the World in *Europe* and *America*, as he told *C. Mather* (and I cited him) *Serious Appeal*, p. 7. And among the rest were some of those *very Books* of *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, out of which he hath since pickt Quarrels, brought in his Book of *The Christian Faith*, &c. as Sound and Orthodox, and to *convince our Opposers*,

posers, that it is and hath been our constant and firm belief to expect Salvation by the Man Christ Jesus, that was outwardly Crucified at Jerusalem (as in *Title Page*, and p. 16.) So that he now *freely acknowledging* (p. 22. of this Book) his *shortness and mistake*, with respect to the *Principles of the Teachers among the* Quakers *universally, and the Principles of* G. Whitehead and W. Penn, as it is to introduce a slander, so is of no weight. The like he had said, *Exact Narrative*, p. 61. and would have me to take that for an answer to my Book, called, *An Apostate Exposed*, but I shall not so excuse him but put him upon answering the Book. If that alone might have served, why did he not put me off so here, and give me no further answer to this Book of mine, I am now defending it gainst his *Remarks*? Nor was *I most uncharitable* to him in alledging (as I did in my Lab. p. 10. and he in part Cites here) that he manifested great hardness, who had so large, so long, so near and intimate Converse among Friends, now all of a sudden to give the lye to all this, and deduce some of his pretended Probations, out of the Books he had so newly commended and recommended? For that is a true State of the Case.

Page 22. He goes on (in said p. 22.) maiming a Quotation of mine out of him, and then insulting over me. I had it thus, 'Seeing this true 'Faith is wrought in Gods ordinary way by 'Preaching, therefore the true Faith of Christ 'Death and Sufferings ought to be one of the 'first and chiefest Things, that every true Ma-

nister

'nister ought to Preach [there he stops with an, *&c.* but had he quoted the rest, his Cavil had been out of Doors, which was thus] 'and 'build up his Hearers in, in order to bring 'them to Communion with God and Christ in 'Spirit, and that they may witness God and 'Christ to dwell in them. Upon this he vaunts, saying, 'It is my Lot to have to do with Men, 'that have neither so much true Logick, nor 'common Sense, as to understand what a true 'Contradiction is [then descanting upon the Words ONE OF THE FIRST, he adds a little lower] 'It is no Contradiction to say, *G.* '*Whitehead* was *one of the first* Quakers —— *G.* '*Fox* was *the first* Quaker. Well, I hope before I have done with him further to manifest, as little as I pretend to Logick, that he hath really contradicted himself, and that not so much from the Words he so plaies upon, as upon what follow, *viz.* [and build up his Hearers in Order to bring them into Communion with God and Christ, and that they may witness God and Christ to dwell in them] If this be true, that the Faith of Christs Death and Sufferings is that which brings into Communion with God, *&c.* the building up therein, that whereby they witness God and Christ to dwell in them, *then to be preached before the inward*; but if it be true, that the Knowledge of Christs inward coming is the more needful and *in the first Place*, as being that by which the true and comfortable use of his outward coming is *alone* sufficiently understood; as he asserted, *Way to the City of God*, p. 3. and I cited him in my

p. 12.

p. 12. *Then the Inward to be Preached before the Outward.* And this is a Contradiction.

But for the better understanding of the Case, the Distinction betwixt General Religion and Christian Religion (he saith) *is to be considered, which Distinction I have used* (adds he) *in my Book, called,* Divine Immediate Revelation and Inspiration, *&c. Answ.* I am beholden to him for this Reference, out of a Book I had not read before; for it not only helpeth me to fresh Passages in General, but even here it makes for me, not for him. For in p. 45. he saith, 'The 'Scriptures do witness abundantly concerning 'such an experimental and spiritually sensible 'Knowledge of God, which is perceived in a 'most inward Union and Communion of the 'Soul with God, and in a certain intellectual 'and spiritual Contact, or Touch, of which 'not only *Plato* and *Plotin*, and others among 'those called Philosophers, but the Apostles a-'mong the Christians, have largely made men-'tion. Hence I query, What Religion theirs was, that of *Plato*, *Plotin* and the Heathen Philosophers? *General* Religion, or the *Christian* Religion? Again, what the most inward Union of their Souls with God, that spiritual Contact, or Touch, that spiritual, sensible Knowledge of God, he allows them to have witnessed; was it with or without the Holy Ghost, seeing as yet Jesus was not so much as born in the Outward?

Page 23. In p. 23. He saith, *It most evidently appears from the express Words of my Book of* Universal Grace, p. 120. *That I did not then hold, that the*

the Light within was sufficient to Salvation without any thing else, as without Christs outward Coming, &c. *Answ.* It will sufficiently appear, to them who duly consult the place, that (even according to *G. Keith*) 'the other Nations [*viz.* the *Gentiles*] 'were not destitute of 'the main and principal thing, even of the 'Manifestation of the Light and Spirit of the 'Son in their Hearts, and that those that did 'improve it, did both know the Lord and his 'Laws, and were JUSTIFIED through Faith 'in him, *&c.* And it will also appear to such as will cast an Eye upon what he hath said, no longer ago than in the Year, 1691. in his *Presb.* and *Ind. Chur.* p 116. that he *then* held, that 'It is no less than real Blasphemy, 'to say, that the Light within is not sufficient, 'to give that Knowledge of God that is necessary unto Salvation. Now if this doth not depretiate the blessed Effects of Christs outward Coming, when delivered by *G. Keith* (which is the Scope of what he offers in the Page under my Consideration) why must it be rendred so to do, when delivered (as he suggests) by us, except to gratifie his rancour, who will allow that Exposition to his own Words, he denies to others ?

In page 24. He makes my Charge to be, *That he did formerly hold that Christs inward coming saves, where the outward is unknown*, in which he renders me guilty *of gross Forgery and Perversion* (for he seldom Charges *lower* in any thing that affects himself) of *Forgery, seeing I cite no passage out of any of his Books,* Page 24.

where

where he expresseth these words, Where the outward is unknown, &c. But is it Forgery to give his words without a Citation? If so, it is his own beloved Crime. Yet had he but turned over the next Leaf in my Book, and minded what he read, he might have found, that I bring him in saying, The *outward Coming, sufferings and Death of Christ, may have and hath a true and real influence, upon them who know it not expresly*. Again, *Why may not many recieve an advantage by Christ, the second* Adam's *Obedience. even in the* outward, *who never knew it expresly*, &c. This might have shut his Cavil out of Doors, had it not been so Natural to him to Wrangle.

He adds, *They* (for that is the word he useth, when he brings any thing out of my Book) *are guilty of grosly Perverting my words and sense, as if I did hold, that Christs inward coming saves, with Eternal Salvation, without all Knowledge of Christs outward coming*. What means he by the tearm, *Eternal Salvation* (which yet were none of my words) are not all that are saved here, saved with *Eternal Salvation?* Or must they be fitted in Purgatory, or in some other Revolution.?

Bnt he is offended that the words *explicit* and *implicit* (which I find not but in his late Books) *are by me called a late Distinction*, saying, *The place of his Book, cited by me, saith no such thing*, yet acknowledgeth, *that in divers of his late Books he hath distinguished betwixt the express and implicit Knowledge*, &c. But hath he made that distinction formerly? if not it is a late distinction:

ſtinction: His alledging that it *is implyed*, that *though not expreſt, yet was really underſtood by him*, is idle, for it is not what he underſtands, but what he gives us to underſtand, what he declares, that is properly called *his Diſtinction*. But he Vindicates it, as what all true *and Orthodox Chriſtians hold* (though he names none) as well as infers it from *Eph.* 3. 6. Which is wide from the purpoſe. The Apoſtle tells, *v.* 5. That *it was not made known as it is now*. How? Not *expreſly*, but *implicitely*? That he ſaith not, although *G. Keith* doth, who in p. 25. from *Rom.* 16. 25, 26. queries, *Now what is made manifeſt, but Expreſs? And what is kept ſecret, but Implicit*? So then, if the Reader would know what *implicit* means, *G. Keith* reſolves him, it is *what is kept ſecret*. I thought it had not deſerved to be called *Knowledge*, while kept ſecret, while not manifeſt, but that the opening, the unvailing, the revealing a thing gives me to know it; but this *Profound Myſtick* hath got a new knack of expounding words, and interpreting the Scriptures, as if Men were ſaved by a knowledge kept ſecret from them. page, 25.

He queries, *Why will they not allow it* (the tearm *implicit*) *as well with reſpect to the knowledge of Chriſt without us, as of Chriſt within us? Anſwer*, I gave him no occaſion thus to object, yet reply, becauſe the knowledg of Chriſt within, is immediate, by a divine ſenſation; the other not always ſo.

Now from my following words, That *G. Keith*'s diſtinction was to *ſerve a turn* (which he

he falſly chargeth upon *G. Whitehead*, who wa
not concerned in my Book, otherwiſe than i
his *Poſtſcript*, as if he thought me too mean
to wreak his Spite at) he falls upon *G. White-
head* for excuſing a paſſage of *G. Fox*'s, which
himſelf had defended, *Serious Appeal*, p. 60
And alſo others excuſing *Iſ. Penington* ſaying
Can outward Blood Cleanſe? The drift where
of is to prove, what we readily grant him
that when our Friends ſenſe hath been per
verted, we have Diſtinguiſhed. My Objectio
againſt him, was that his were not cogent
will he Object the ſame, let him detect them
as I have done his. Yet I cannot but tak
notice of that paſſage of my Fathers [Can out
ward Blood Cleanſe?] for it ſeems droppe
by him, as with a deſign of miſchief. Wher
I ſhall take occaſion to add, That my Father
denied not the attonement made by Chriſt
offering up his Blood in the outward, to ſuc
as received him into their Souls, but acknow
ledged the remiſſion of his Sins thereby, a
may be ſeen in his Book, ſtiled, *Fleſh and Blo
of Chriſt, both in the Myſtery, and in the outward*
&c. Printed in his works, Part. 2. p. 180. An
that *G. Keith well knew him to be a true believe
in the Lord Jeſus, and a ſincere Lover of him
even the Crucified Jeſus*, himſelf hath declared
Serious Appeal, p. 25. Alike miſchievous is he
in Inſinuating *G. Whitehead* his excuſing *Soloma
Eccles* his *Blaſphemy* (as he terms it) in ſaying
*The Blood that came out of Chriſts Side, was n
more than the Blood of another Saint.* Though
G. Whitehead ſought to Evince that *S. Eccles*
meanin

meaning was better than his words, yet he also declared, that he did not *make* S. Eccles's *Expressions therein* (*especially as Construed by our Adversaries*) *to be an Article of our Faith* (See *Light and Life*, p. 59.) To this, being formerly alledged by *G. Keith*, hath *T. Ellwood* answered in *Truth Defended*, p. 111. Which *G. Keith* takes no notice of, but renews his Slander, as if it had been *new*, so unfair an Adversary is he.

From my arguing, That the word *Express*, is a word of Course with him, and of no force, from his using it, even with respect to *Adams* Posterity, suffering disadvantage by his Disobedience, who never knew it expressly, that of them that knew it not at all, neither implicitely nor explicitely, there have perished, he not only puts me *upon the Proof*, but *reects it as False* and *Fictitious*, p 26. The which, although I account an impertinent Cavil, and demonstrative on its self, to any but a Captious person; yet from his asserting, *Universal Grace*, p. 117. *That the knowledge of Christ in the outward, is not of necessity unto Salvation, save only where it is revealed*, I argue, How much less necessary then is the knowledge of the first *Adam*'s coming in the outward, to man's Damnation? Must the Deaf and Dumb, who Die impenitent, needs have a discovery from God ther explicitely or implicitely, that *Adam* had sinned, in order to their Condemnation? Or it not sufficient, that they have Transgressed the Holy Law in themselves? That they themselves have Sinned? Page 15.

To enforce it, he adds, *That it is evident from the Heathen Philosophers writings* (who? and where?) *and particularly from* Plato (where?) *that they knew, at least implicitely, the Fall of Man*, &c. Supposing this to be true of SOME, what follows? That they ALL knew it? Surely not so: Therefore let him, who is so brisk upon me for a Proof, calling my assertion False and Fictitious, prove his own, *viz.* That all knew it, either explicitely or implicitely.

He adds, How can any impartial Reader that Reads my Books, when I so oft restrict the Words with the Terms, *Express*, *clear*, *distinct Knowledge*, *Historical*, *outward Knowledge*? (And so he leaves his Sentence imperfect with a sally, to tell how intimate *R. B.* and he were, what DIscourses they had, *&c.* All which, as they bespeak his Vanity, and seem introduced to get an esteem to his Cause, from the Credit of such a *Collegue*, so they depending upon no better evidence than his own, have no weight with me) To the other I answer, what occasion he had to use these words I know not, but it might be the Terms of his *Opponent*, to which he, as *Respondent* was tyed, for I find it was so, with respect to *R. Gordon*, who had that word [Express] as well as that of *Universal Grace*.

From *G. Keith* his acknowledging, that many of them who knew something of Christ's outward coming, that it was very darkly, and under Vails and Figures, and his having excepted others, the many thousands, he said

we

were saved before Christs coming in the outward, and my thence inferring, *There is no medium between knowing very darkly in Vails and Figures (implicitely in a very obscure degree.) And not knowing at all, as in my* p. 15 He to *confute my Ignorance* (for he calls it both *Nonsensical and Ignorant*) saith, ' Is there no Medium between knowing very darkly, and not knowing at all? Is the Particle or little word [very] Superlative in the highest Degree? Or is it not rather Comparative? Is there no Medium betwixt a Mans being very Ignorant, and knowing nothing at all? Answer, I know no difference betwixt being *very Ignorant*, and knowing *not at all, nothing* of that whereof he is very Ignorant: For where's the middle between knowledge that is very dark, and not knowing at all? The knowing a thing very darkly and under Vails and Figures, being the *lowest degree* of knowledge, as well as the *lowest means* of knowing, the next step is not knowing at all. That is implicit knowledge in the remotest sense; what is below this, is Ignorance: But *Envy* and *Malice* is *worse* than both. For he is not satisfyed with filing it upon my Score only, but he must render it as *G. Whitehead's Logick, who hath either writ this Book, that I answer*, saith G Keith, *or approved it*, and Concludeth, *Therefore* G. Whitehead *is as Ignorant in true Logick, as in true Divinity. Answer*, If I had committed a trip (which he hath not proved against me, for all his bluster) what is that to *G. Whitehead's* Logick or Divinity? Is he so Hawk-eyed, as no

false Logick can scape him, but he can esp at once hearing a Book Read, for a second G *Whitehead* had not till it came in Print? O is he not rather herein like *Hamman*, wh *thought scorn to lay Hands on* Mordecai *alone*, bu *sought to destroy all the Jews?* Esth. 3, 6 And yet at last, the passage remains sound an unshaken, notwithstanding all his Cavils.

To prove *Forgery and Perversion upon* me for *making him say, Men have been saved wit out the express Knowledge of Christs outward com ing, but not of his inward coming*, he saith, *Ma ny have felt and enjoyed the Blessed Vertue a Power of Christ, within them, and so have ha an implicit Knowledge of it*, &c. He that re flected upon *G. Whitehead*'s *Logick* and *Divi nity*, even now, what is become of his own Is the Knowledge received by Divine sensa tion, the knowing the Vertue and Power o Christ to save from Sin, by its Vertuous an Powerful operation in them, an *implicit* know ledge? Is knowing a Tree by its Fruits, a express or implicit Knowledge, that it is good But he renders it implicit, because not known by the *express Names* of Jesus and Christ. *An swer*, They knew the thing *expressly*, the out ward name not at all, not so much as *impli citely*; They knew that which saved, but it is *not the meer outward Name, that saves*, sai *G. Keith, Universal Grace*, p. 115

In the next place let us hear his Appeal to the School-Boys, it is to be hoped his own *Scholars* will give it for him. *Let any School Boy, or Tyro, or Person of common sense, Judge*

(sait

faith he, p. 27.) *if these two Propositions, The express Knowledge and Faith of Christ is not necessary to all that shall be saved; Some Knowledge and Faith of Christ, is necessary to all that shall be saved, be Contradictory. Answer*, He varies the Terms to mislead his Reader; in the one he hath it, the Express knowledge, in the other *some* knowledge, and the word *express* left out. However his own Scholars might overlook this, perhaps being taught no better, at least from their Masters Example, yet with considerate Men this will gain him no Credit. For would he have beeen fair, he should wholly have left out [Express] in the first or inserted them in both. But I shall state the Case, *de novo*, and that more agreeable to his own Positions, whether to say, *True Religion and Christianity may subsist without the knowledge of Christ in the Letter*, and to say, *Faith in Christ Jesus*, as he *came without us in the Flesh, and Died*, &c. *Is necessary to make a true Christian*, be Contradictory. And I the rather put it for that he hath Galloped from p. 15. to p. 23. of my Book, and left several citations of mine, and these two just now cited (which were in p 20. and p. 21.) behind him. A demonstration he cared not to cope with them, but had rather catch at a passage, mistate it, and so go off. To my citations out of two of his former books (where he allowed, that the true and ONLY Method to bring People into the Faith and acknowledgment of the Christian Religion was first to inform them of an universal inward Principle, which would, when this Founda-

Page 27.

tion was laid, bring them to own the Scripture and what Christ did and suffered, *&c.* And th the contrary was not good order and me thod) he grants it here p. 27. but with a r serve and limitation, saying, *What is necess in the first place, to be Preached to them that ha little or no true Knowledge of God, or of an inwa Principle, is one thing; and what is first to Preached in order to bring Men to the Christi Faith and Religion more immediately and pro mately, is another.* *Answer*, When he said (I cited him in my p. 23.) 'This is the tr 'method and order, which the Lord h 'taught us to hold forth unto People— 'the first place to point and turn their mi 'unto the Light of Jesus Christ, *&c.* Ag in my p. 24. 'It is for want of this true o 'der in Preaching of the Gospel, that m 'have had so little success hitherto, *&c.* W he writing to some Preachers, that were g ing into the *Indies*, among the Heathen, or his own Country-Men, that lived among u Did we hold it forth, to be Preacht in t first place, with a restriction to those pa of the World, where the outward was n revealed, or. indefinitely? Besides, if to t Gentiles it was to be Preached in the first pla as that which would give them the knowled of the outward, why not to the Christia who are attained to a belief of the outwa yet too many undervalue the inward, see such as have had a belief of the outward, w be confirmed therein by the inward, as w as others taught it, who had not known it bef even as himself hath confessed,

He concludes, '*What do my Adversaries* '*bring against me on this Head, to prove my self* '*Contradiction? Nothing at all* (saith he) *therefore* '*they shew themselves stronger in falsly accusing, than* '*in justly proving*, adds he. *Answer*, Had he not been *stronger in falsly accusing, then became him*, he had not thus falsly accused me: For I proved his *self-Contradiction*, and told him where, *viz.* In *Nameless Bull*, p. 10. 11. Which I had quoted before, in my p. 11. It is true, I did not there give the words at length (having done it before) but I gave the Title and Page of his Book, and referred to my having *already* given it, in that very Book. So that he hath Slandered me *wittingly*.

In p. 29. of my Book, I compared his saying, It is not the meer outward name that saveth, but the Life, the Power of Christ that quickens, cleanseth and purifieth, & by this they might be saved, for it is the Life that saveth, *Rom.* 5. 10. With a Friends saying, as himself gives it, that the Blood which cleanseth from all Sin, was the Life, and the Life was the Light, which he then termed *a perverse Exposition*, and called the Friend, *Bold*, *Ignorant Soul*, and I deemed as *authentick*, as *G. Keith* his saying the *same*. Under this he is uneasy, and having skipped many pungent places, from p. 25. to 29. to come at it, whereto he forgets ever to return, such a Slippery Adversary have I to deal with, he Labours as to justify his own, so to brand the Friends words. For himself he pleads, p. 28. *He doth not in the least Remember, that ever he gave that Exposition on* 1 Jo. 1. 7. Page 28.

1. 7. And perhaps, when Examined, the Friend may say, He doth not in the least remember, he ever did so. But hath *G. Keith* never *unduly applyed places of Scripture, to defend things that were Truths, but did not really prove these Truths, either by express Words or proper Consequence?* Let him Consult what himself hath acknowledged, *True Copy*, p. 18. If so, why so harsh upon the Friend? Had he then *retracted* those Errors (or hath he done it yet?) when he fell so roughly upon the other? Or hath he forgot what Christ said to such an one! *Thou Hypocrite, First cast out the Beam out of thy own Eye*, &c. Matt. 7. 5. Thus much on the *exposition*, Now to the *Doctrine* it self. Is it true Doctrine that the Life Cleanseth? *G. Keith* hath said it; the Friend hath said it. Charity makes the best Construction: But *G. Keith's Charity begins at home*, and ends there too, for he reserves *none* for his Neighbour. *If I had said nothing but the Life within saveth or cleanseth from all Sin, they might have justly so argued* (saith *G. Keith* on his own behalf) If the Friend had said nothing, but the Life within saves, *&c. G. Keith* might have justly so argued, say I. He goes on, *There are several Concurrent Causes in the great Work of our Salvation, and cleansing from Sin, which though agreeing in one Harmony, yet one Cause is not the other, therefore their Argument is Vain and False. Answer*, Argument I made none, bnt comparison of sentence with sentence, nor do I yet see wherein the Friend could be unsound, if *G. Keith* be sound, for this explication is as applicable to the one as to the other. My

My quoting him, [Though *Prophets and Apostles* preached him [Christ] as in the form of a Man, yet they Preached him also, and that more generally, as a Light to the Gentiles, yea and to Jews also] he terms a *false and perverse sense, upon the word* more generally, *as if he did signify by it, more frequently, which* (he saith) *he did not, but by more generally, that he did and doth understand that his inward appearance was more general than his outward, therefore what was in it self more general, they Preacht to be so:* And then tells us, how much oftner they Preached his outward than inward appearance, wherein he saith not true. Now that this is a false Gloss, and shews he *wants Sincerity*, the words and his sense then plainly intimating that *more generally* had relation to *Preaching* not *appearance* will appear upon consulting the place, *Light of Truth*, p. 16, 17. In order whereto, let us recur to the Spring, to the Objection his Adversary raised, which was not that Christs inward appearance was more general than his outward, but that our saying (as the place hath it) *That Christ was sometimes Preached as Crucified, to the Jews, but* MORE GENERALLY *a Light to the Gentiles*, inferred *two Christs*, which *G. Keith* tells him is a *most pitious and abominable wresting of those words, and that though the Prophets and Apostles preached him, as in the form of a Man, yet they Preached him also, and that more generally as a Light to the Gentiles, yea and to the Jews also.* Here is never a word (either in Opponent or Respondent) that his inward appearance

pearance was more general than his outward, that whatwas in it self more general theyPreached to be so (which *G. Keith* would now foist in) but as the SOMETIMES related to his being *Preached as Crucified, to the Jews*, so the MORE GENERALLY *as a Light to the Gentiles*, was also restricted to the so Preaching him, yet with this addition that *G. Keith* then allowed it, yet further, that it was more generally Preached to both Jew and Gentile. A Contradiction had been more excusable, than such a deceitful Cover.

His *Secondly* cites no Page of mine in particular, but hath a general reference from p. 15. to 33. (which gives him scope, to skip as he pleaseth) *They perversly infer*, saith he, *from my words, that whereas I formerly made the knowledge and Faith of the History of Christs outward coming, not Essential to Religion, now I did make it Essential.* This he accounts *Palpable Forgery*, denies *any of the citations I bring prove it*, and at last recurs to his late distinction of *implicit Knowledge and Faith.* But this is a meer begging of the question, that who were saved by the inward, had ALL of them the implicit Faith and Knowledge of the outward, not brought till of late, whatever he pretend of his understanding it so all a long, and is impugned by me, p. 14, 15. Particularly from *Luke* 24. 10, 11. From whence I again argue, That the Disciples themselves were so far from having an implicit Faith in Christ, that he should Dye and rise again, that they disbelieved it, *It seemed to them as idle Tales, and*

they

they believed them not, and that even after he had *sent them out two and two*, and the *Devils* had been *subject to them*, Chap. 10. *ver.* 1, and 17. If the Reader be disposed to cast an Eye back to my p. 15, to p. 33. he will yet more evidently see, I have not wronged him, and perhaps be convinced wherefore *G. Keith* dropped them.

To his Thirdly, Wherein he repeats his Notion concerning *Cornelius*, *not having the Holy Ghost in his Gentile-State*, &c. as it hath been largely treated of, in this very Tract, under my first Head, I referr thereto: Yet he persisting p. 29. to deny the *Holy Ghost is in Wicked Men, or the pious* Gentiles, *and that none have it but Believers in Christ crucified*, and yet acknowledging the Word near to be Christ, an Administration of the Gospel to be given in all Ages of the World, the Spirit the same, the Rule the same, the Faith the same, (see *Universal Grace*, p. 8. *Immediate Revelation*, p. 107, 108. *Truths Defence*, p. 70. forecited) shews he would divide Christ from his Spirit, and is contradictory. A further instance whereof take out of his Book of *Divine Immediate Revelation*, p. 63. where he saith, 'Cornelius received the Spirit immediately and yet obtained it FURTHER by means of *Peter*'s Preaching: Whereas now he denieth he had the Holy Ghost in his Gentile-State: But it is become habitual to him, since he turned from Truth, to contradict himself and his former Writings. *Page 29.*

To my Question, *Whether any Prayer is heard*

heard by God, but what is put up by his Spirit? He Answers, *Nay, but Servants and Pious* Gentiles, *such as* Cornelius *was in his Gentile-State, may be and are helped to Pray by the Spirit, having the influence of the first Ministration of the Spirit, which though remotely Preparatory, yet doth not instate the Soul into Union with the Spirit*, &c. Whence had he this? Or how doth he prove, that Mens Souls are not in Union with the Spirit, when helped to pray by the Spirit? Surely, as there are Degrees of Ministration, so there are Degrees of Union, and Degrees of Acceptance, *Diversities of Gifts, but the* SAME *Spirit*, 1 Cor. 12. 4. But he goes on, *And were not my Adversaries extream blind and ignorant, they might understand how the Apostle calleth one and the same Spirit, the Spirit of Servitude, and the Spirit of Adoption*, Rom 8. 15. Doth he bring this for or against himself? If the Spirit, in the Son and the Servant, be *one and the same* Spirit, it must be the *Holy* Spirit: It is Everlastingly Holy in its self, Holy in every Operation and Ministration in Man; but in Degree, the Administrations differ, the Law must be passed under, before the Sonship is known; it is the Spirit of *Holiness* in every step, so denominated from its Effects, though the *Sonship* is not the first step.

He goes on, *These Mens arguing that Men may be Eternally Saved*, &c. *who have no Faith or Knowledge of Christ without them, do sufficiently declare what Heathens they are, and of what little value they make the Faith and Knowledge of Christ Crucified, and that their Religion is nothing but Deism,*

Deism, &c. *Answ.* We do not believe that, that Faith is not necessary to Salvation to us, to whom the means of knowing it, is offered, but the contrary: But that, where it is *not revealed, it is not of Necessity unto Salvation*, G. Keith hath *granted.* There it is more than *Deism*, yea *Christianity*, for *believing in the Light, they do believe in Christ.* See *Universal Grace*, p. 117. and p. 30.

In his Fourthly, he cites a Passage of mine imperfectly, out of *Rector Corrected*, p. 150. and then makes his flourish. To a *Question* of the *Rector* of *Arrow*, *whether the Light within sufficiently tells us*, that *the Messiah is come*, born, had real Flesh, dyed, *&c. G. Keith* Answers, *that it doth teach, That there is a God that created all things, that he is most Holy, Just, and Wise, a plentiful Rewarder of them that fear him*, &c. and that *these are* AS NECESSARY *Truths as any*, &c. (See my p. 22.) Upon this I argued (and *G. Keith* hath dropt both Quotation and Argument) *If the Holy Ghost be given* ONLY *to the one Faith, not to the other, surely that one Faith must needs be the most necessary Faith.* Now to the other part [that many, who never had the Scriptures, yet if faithful to the Light, whether they have not been accepted, have not believed in the Light, by believing in Christ, who is the Light] he queries, *But where is my Contradiction here?* Answ. Even in what I have cited above, and he hath crastily left out. He goes on, *Did I ever say, That Men may believe in the Light, or Christ within, and never at any Time, from first to last*

believe

believe in Christ without, either explicitely or implicitely? For this they bring no Proof, and I believe they cannot, ſaith he. *Anſw.* It was not the *Rectors* Queſtion, Whether they that dyed without it, and had it not at *firſt*, ſhould have it at *laſt*, in ſome other Revolution? Perhaps neither of them dreamt of that Diſtinction, when the Book was wrote. Nor whether they ſhould have it *explicitely* or *implicitely*, but whether the Light doth ſufficiently tell it? He ſhould in his Anſwer have made that Diſtinction, if he would have it allowed him now; but inſtead of that, to an indefinite Queſtion, he gives an indefinite Anſwer, aſſerting there are Truths as neceſſary that it doth teach, and that they that believe in the Light [believe theſe neceſſary Truths thus revealed] believe in Chriſt, and are accepted.

I having in my p. 25, 26. cited *G. Keith* [That Eternal Life and Salvation is only to be had through the Knowledge and Faith of Chriſt Crucified — that this Faith is indiſpenſibly neceſſary to all —— The Work of Sanctification aſcribed in Scripture to Chriſts Blood and Sufferings, as well as to his inward Appearance, and to both indiſpenſibly neceſſary, and to Faith therein.] I oppoſed them, p. 26, to 31. to his former ſayings, *G. Keith* giving the go-by to the reſt, toucheth upon this Paſſage [The Work of Sanctification, *&c.*] *Thus we*
Page 30. *ſee plainly* (ſaith he p. 30.) *they place* ALL *upon Chriſt within, and* NOTHING *upon Chriſt without*, and adds, *O bold Antichriſtianiſm*, &c! But he ſees amiſs, I did not here give Mine or my

my Friends Sentiments either way (that I had done before, p. 11.) but opposed *G. Keith* to *G. Keith*: Yet may now tell him, We do not place all upon Christ within, nor all upon Christ without; we do not divide Christ, but believe it was necessary that he should come, as well as that it was afterwards expedient, he should go away, and that the belief of both is a Duty, even *in order to Salvation*, where the means of having it, are afforded. And himself hath said, *The Knowledge of Christs coming in the outward, is not of necessity to Salvation, save only where it is revealed*: Which as it was one of the places among many other I cited (see my p. 30.) in Contradiction to the three Passages above; so had he no Reason to say here, *But wherein I have contradicted that Assertion, they shew not*; for I both shewed and directed my Reader to fourteen contradictory Assertions out of his Book of *Universal Grace*, from my p. 26. to 31. and declared p. 26. (immediately after the Quotation he brings) that I so brought them.

In his Sixthly, he creeps in at the Tail of a Citation of Mine [Nor is the outward Name that which saveth, but the inward Nature, Vertue, *&c.*] thus, *But they no where shew how I contradict this.* Answ. That is false, for it is one of these *fourteen* I mentioned even now. He goes on, *I say still, it is not the outward Name either of God or Christ, that saveth without the inward Nature, Vertue and Power, which dwels and dwells in all fulness in the Man Christ Jesus*, &c. Here he falsifieth his own Quotation, as if

if there were no difference between saying, It is not the outward Name that saveth, BUT the inward Nature, *&c.* and saying, It is not the outward Name that saves WITHOUT the inward Nature, *&c.* So little doth he regard what becomes a fair Adversary. Had he took my Sentence entire his Contradiction had been obvious. In Order to clear an Objection himself had raised, *That there can be no Justification without Faith in Christ, but these* Gentiles *had not Faith in Christ, therefore,* &c. he Answers *by denying the second Proposition,* thus, 'If they 'did cleave unto, and believe in the Light 'they believe in Christ, for he is the Light 'nor is the outward Name that which saveth 'but the inward Nature, Virtue and Power 'signified thereby; which was made manifest 'in them, *&c.* So that here he ascribes Salvation in these *Gentiles* to the *inward* Work, who, according as stated on the Objection, were supposed not to have Faith in Christ, but they believing in the Light, he saith, they have, and so contradicts that other saying, alledged above, that the *Faith of both* the inward and outward coming, *is indispensibly necessary to all.*

He often laies to my Charge, that *I bring no place to prove where he contradicts himself*; but that is not true: He leaps over my Proofs, that he may not see them, picking here and there a Passage, in reading over many Pages, and perhaps chuseth such, as lye most remote from my comparing, wherein the Contradiction lies. So here (in his *Seventhly*) upon my quoting him, *That these* Gentiles (he leaves out, *who did call*

upon

pon the Name of the Lord, and were saved, and dds, which was not there, *had the Gospel Preach-d unto them, who* goes on) *were not under any utward Administration of the Gospel:* And then al-edgeth, I bring no place to prove where he con-radicts this Assertion. I will tell him, Let him nt read two Lines further, and it will direct im, *where*, viz. in *Truth Advanced*, p. 70. But guess, I ken his meaning, why he left out [did all upon the Name of the Lord] and put n [had the Gospel preached unto them] *viz.* hat he might hook in the next Citation of Mine, hich more touched him, without a particular eply. For this was but a Proem to that, here from the Apostles saying, *They have not d obeyed*, I shew he allows *the very Gospel hath en Preached unto all, otherwise* (saith he) *they ould never have been charged with not having o-yed it*: And upon that, I put him to prove, hat the History of Christs Birth, Crucifixion, c. was ever preached to all, either explicite-or implicitely, seeing he saith, the very Go-el hath been; and secondly, that such recei-ed not the Holy Ghost, as in p. 28. of Mine, this like a Man? Or a Scholar? And that to e he so vndervalues, as having neither true ogick, nor common Sense? And whereas he n Answer to the jumbled Quotation he brings) ledgeth that the *former Distinction will serve re, of express and implicite*, this is to affirm, ot prove. If Time or *Ability* had not failed m, surely it behoved him to have done it.

What he would have to be *Noted*, as if the *ain Branch of the Question were, of the Necessi-*

ty of our Faith in Christ crucified to our Salvation who are professed Christians, I do note, as a *notable* slander, for Proof whereof he referring us to his own Evidence (some where or other in his *Exact Narrative*, for he tells us not where) I Answer, I doubt not, but if there, the Reader will find it replied to, in the *Answer* to the *Narrative*.

How the most pious and upright among the Gentiles were saved by Faith in Christ Crucified, who had not Faith outwardly Preached, he now says *may be one of these Secret things that belong to God and not to us, till he please to reveal it.* Why doth he meddle with them then, and prove quarrelsom about it? Why seek to comprehend it, and describe it, by the *City of Refuge*, &c. where he tells us, they are *shut up* as in a *Custody* or *Safeguard*, till the Faith come to be revealed? But this 'tis to hold Notions, a Man dares not defend.

In his Eighthly, he brings me in thus quoting him, *He* [*Christ*] *left not the other Nations destitute of the main and principal Thing, even the Manifestation of the Light*, &c. [I added there, *which would have given them the Knowledge of God, and of all his Laws and Statutes needful to be known by them*] Hereupon he Paraphrases upon his own Words, *main and principal thing, I we think, he meant the Light within, compared with Christ without*, he tells us, *we deceive our selves.* Answ. That it was such a Manifestation as gave the Knowledge of God, and of all his Laws and Statutes needful to be known by them, are his own Words. And seeing the

were

were destitute of something, what was that they had not, and now have not, whence they are denominated *Gentiles* (that which he queried upon (as I instanced in my p. 31.) *seeing it hath been so in Times past, why may it not be so now*) but even that which we have, from whence we are denominated *Christians?*

From my Book he sallies to *G. Whitehead's Postscript*, whither I now follow him. His Notion of the Revolutions I had deduced from what himself had laid down in his Book, called, *Truth Advanced:* The same *G. Whitehead* charges upon him from Personal Conference; to which in general *G. Keith* replies by referring to his Book, called *Truth and Innocency Defended* (wherein the Reader may find he is rather *Evasive* than *plain*) and to his *Appendix* to the *General History of the* Quakers, without citing any Passage out of them, and then excepts against *G. Whitehead's* Evidence, from his Words, *If I mistake not*, adding in a Scoff, *Is this like Infallible* George Whitehead? See p. 31. To which I Answer, The Words having been spoken about twelve Years ago, it became not *G. Whitehead* to be over Positive, as to every Circumstance, as whether it was the first Point in difference betwixt them, whether the Transmigration was to be of all Souls, or of some of them, and how many particular Scriptures he argued from, &c. but as to the *Main* he is *Positive, I am sure*, saith *G. Whitehead, he argued for that Notion* (of the Revolution of Humane Souls) *in a Book of his in Manuscript; which he shewed me before he went over*

Page 31

into America, *that he then dissuaded him fr*
Printing it, and withal *that* G. Keith *told hi*
since his return, he had brought it over with him, a
in said *Postscript*, p. 50, 51. So that *G. Keith*
flourish is very Empty and Idle, *G. Whitehead*
Evidence being in so many respects full and po
sitive.

He goes on, *If such a Manuscript were such*
Crime in G. Keith, *to render me an Apost*
[I find no ground he hath so to suggest] *a*
gone from Truth, why did not G. Whitehe
give me Gospel Order, &c? *Answ.* I do no
find but he did give *Private Admonition*, and th
it had that Effect, as to dissuade him fro
Printing it. But that every Error in Judgme
should Anathematize a Man, and render hi
no Brother, especially while kept *Private* an
not Divulged, he may see is not our way, b
the friendly Correspondence afterwards hel
between *G. Fox*, *G. Whitehead* and him, whic
although he now make so ill an use of, as if
were *Hypocrisy* in them, so to do, as to excu
his late calling *G. Whitehead*, *Dear Geo. Whit*
head, even when his Heart was not with hi
and his Brethren, but he had broke out in
Enmity and Prejudice; yet are not the Cas
Parallel.

But leaving G. Whitehead *a while, let me r*
turn a little to the Book, saith *G. Keith*, whic
shews, he assigns the Book to another Autho
notwithstanding his former laying it to G
Whitehead. That which comes next is th
Whereas *G. Keith in an Answer* to an Obj
ction, that *Adam dyed not that Day that he s*
n

ned, &c. had alledged, that *Adam not living a compleat thousand Years, which in Scriptures signifies sometimes a Day*, Psalm 90. *It may be said, he lived not a whole Day*, I replied, *That this is a Principle of the Revolutionists is plain to all that know their Principles, and that it is his, is also manifest* [there *G. Keith* stops, but I go on] *in that he gives it as one of the Answers to the Objection.* Upon this he Vaunts, saying, p. 32. *What lame Evidence and Argument is this?* And then tells us, *Justin Martyr, and many others, Worthy, Antient and Late Christian Writers held, that a thousand Years in Scripture sometimes signifie a Day* (which they might for ought I know, for he thinks it enough to assert, without directing us, where to find it) and at length gives us the same from Scripture. But all this will not help him, the Question is not whether a thousand Years doth not in Scripture sometimes signifie a Day; but whether it did so in that Place, where it is said to *Adam, In the Day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely dye*; and whether giving that Interpretation there to that Objection, did not involve him, in the Notion of the Revolutionists, who so construe the Place, and therefrom labour to defend their Notion. Page 32.

Though he like not to be esteemed a favourer of Revolutionism, (telling us in the last Line of this Page, his *not daring to defend it, did not proceed from fear of being defamed, but seeing he pretends to no such Assurance in the Case*, &c.) Yet would he fain perswade us, we *make Paul* and *Beza alike guilty in the Case of the Revolutions, if the Words of* Paul, *Gal.* 3. 22, 23. *be but*

well considered. *Answ.* That that Place speaks of a State after Death, doth not appear, but *G. Keith* doth, in saying, ' So that had they ' dyed in that State, they could not have pe- ' rished, even as the Man-slayer was safe in the ' City of Refuge; (Thus in my p. 33. I quoted him out of *Truth Advanced*, p. 43.) On the contrary the Author to the *Hebrews* saith, *As it is appointed unto Men once to dye, but after this the Judgment, so Christ was once offered*, Heb. 9. 27, 28. So have I answered one Scripture by another. And now he need not say (as he here doth, p. 33.) *Suppose that twelve Years ago I was in an Error, will that prove that I hold them still?* For his holding them still is proved by other Mediums, of which the Instance above is one. Nor yet hath he cause to suggest, that it is *too probable if* G. Whitehead *could have revealed any secret; that would have taken away his Life, he would have done it*: For that is but a malicious Insinuation, what *G. Whitehead* declared being now no secret in it self, nor was it probable that what *G. Keith* communicated to him, and designed to Print, was imparted as a Secret.

Page 33.

Now we are come to my Fourth Head, *of Christ and the Saints glorified Bodies*, wherein I opposed *G. Keith*'s Notion in *Truth Advanced*, p. 111. saying, ' *Paul distinguisheth* between the ' Belly and the Body, saying, God will destroy ' the Belly, but he doth not say, he will de- ' stroy the Body, for seeing after the Resurre- ' ction of the Dead, Men shall need none of the ' Meats of this corruptible World, nor shall ' they

'they need a Belly to put them in, as Guts and 'Draught, or any gross Parts, as Men have now. This I represented as a very carnal Conception of the Resurrection, and opposed to his former Sentiments, wherein he declared the *glorified Bodies* both of Christ and the Saints to be wholly *Spiritual*. For indeed what Analoge is there between a spiritual Body, and that Body which is not to be destroyed, but only the Belly, Guts and Draught of it? Herein he seems well-deserving the Character of a Carnal Conceiver, which I fastned on him, and this Answers *G. Keith*'s Query, *Do these Words prove that I have Carnal Conceptions of the Resurrection, like those Sadducees?* To the second, *Did not the Sadducees altogether deny the Resurrection?* I Answer, Yes: Yet the *Idea* they conceived thereof, in such as did believe it, was very carnal, witness their Instance in the seven Men that married one Woman: But upon a groundless Presumption, that I had inferred his saying, that Men should have Belly, Guts and Draught after the Resurrection, which I never intended, he bestows his vulgar Rhetorick of *Perversion and downright Forgery* upon me, then refers p. 34. to his Book called *Truth Advanced*, which I am willing enough the Reader should see, for there he will find more of the same Leaven, and lastly his Answer to the Bishop of *Aberdeen*'s queries, which was *Extant* as he saith, *thirty Years ago*. *Answ.* His former Sentiments therein being found, (if they were so) doth not prove his latter were so: But that he hath contradicted himself, in this

Page 34.

 and

and other particulars, is too notorious, I doubt not, to such as have read my former, and shall read these.

The next thing is concerning *Water-Baptism* and the *Supper*, wherein I shewed, that one while he pretended to be moderate in his Judgment concerning them, another while represented them as *abolished Shadows*, and *legal Rites buried*, and *not to be raised up again*, as in my p. 35, to 42. More Instances I could give, but I reserve them till further Service calls for them, these being shifted by him; though upon occasion of my opposing some of his Queries (in *Truth Advanced*, p. 183, 184.) to his declared contradictory Sense formerly he alledgeth, that they were *simply proposed by him as Queries, and plainly distinguished from Positions*, and that at *Turners*-Hall *some made the excuse, They did but Query. Answ.* That Account or *Narrative* of what passed at *Turners*-Hall, being given by himself, who is a Party and none of the fairest Adversaries, I dare not confide in, and therefore apply my self to himself thus, That if I did believe he would deny there were *affirmative Interrogatives*, Queries in the Nature of Affirmations, I would hunt for a passage I lately saw in a Book of his, that would give it against him. For that these were so, *coupled* with Positions, *not distinguished* from them, is plain in that they were proposed, as tending to *Love, Peace and Unity among the Sincere Professors of the Lord Jesus Christ* (see *Truth Advanced*, p. 173.) which if he will not be bound by, what are they brought for, or

what

what a slippery Chapman will these Men have of him? But to go on, from his adding of these Sincere Professors, that they *hold the Head, and Build on the true Foundation, and yet differ in some lesser Matters*: I observed, that at the same Time no Epithets were (with him) black enough upon his *quondam* Friends, whom he sometimes boasts he hath been upwards of thirty Years amongst. *G. Keith* taking hold of that Passage [hold the Head, and build on the true Foundation] and giving the other the slip, renders us *so unchristianly uncharitable* (as he saith, *we too evidently shew we are*) *as to judge none in* Christendom *differing from us in Profession, hold the Head, or are Sincere Professors of the Lord Jesus Christ, but we only.* But he runs too fast, and in his Prejudice outruns himself. We do not so judge, though he, while so *unchristianly uncharitable* (they are his own Words) to his *quondam* Friends, and yet seeking to claw with others, that he might Nest somewhere, deserved that rebuke.

Now let us hear what a kind of *Retractation* he makes. The Reader may perhaps expect some great matter, if he be enformed, what large Notice he hath given before hand, above a twelve Month ago, and how he bespoke his own Praise in the being free to do it. For in his Book, called, *True Copy* (Dated in the third Month, 1695.) in Order to introduce what he called, *A short List of the Vile and gross Errors of* G. Whitehead, J. Whitehead, W. Penn, &c. he 'freely acknowledgeth, that upon a re-

'view

'view of his former Books of *Immediate Reve-*
'*lation*, *Universal Grace*, *Rector Corrected*, and
'*Truth defended*, he hath found some Passages
'and Words, that not only need some further
'Explanation, but even in some Part an Emenda-
'tion and Correction: And thanks Almighty
'God, that has not only given him to see them,
'but has given him that Humility of Heart,
'Love to Truth, and regard to the Salvation
'of Souls, that he can freely both acknowledge
'and correct his former Mistakes, after the ex-
'ample of some worthy Ancients, *True Copy*,
'p. 17. What could be expected from hence,
but something besides flourish, from such as did
not know *G. Keith*, especially considering he
hath took Time for it? All he gives is this,
I am not ashamed (says he here, p. 34, 35.)
to own my general Mistakes, I have been under,
concerning divers Places of Scriptures, particularly
Relative to Water-Baptism and the Supper, as
Mat. 28. 19. and 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. *And some other*
Places of Scripture, relative to some other Matters,
especially in the Misapplication of some Places, to
prove certain Truths, which these Places did not
prove — And I am so far from being ashamed to
Publish this Confession, that I have great Peace and
Joy in it. Answ. This Confession is as *Lame*,
as he pretends in another Place *G. Whitehead's*
Evidence to be; but two particular Scriptures
named, the rest General, as if he designed a
reserve, when more of his Contradictions are
laid open, who notwithstanding the *Joy and*
Peace he pretends to have in his Publication, is
very uneasily drawn to this little, and perhaps,
had

had not I forced him to it by exposing of him, had stayed yet another twelve Month, before he had given them, which yet Falls abundantly short of what was proposed in his *True Copy*, no *Emendation* or *Correction* being yet extant to those four Books; he there both promised to exhibit, and assigned as needing them. Thus *Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus:* All *G. Keith*'s empty crack ends in a Ridiculous Boast.

I shall follow him upon this subject, though he unseasonably interposeth what comes not in course. In his p. 36. upon his querying [whether it may not be said, there is one Baptism, as there is one Land called *America*, though the Map or Figure of it is also called *America*, even as there is but one Spiritual Baptism with the Holy Ghost, though the outward Baptism with Water is also called Baptism] opposed thereto his asserting [That the Scriptures are not that word, more than a Map or Description of *Rome* or *London*, is *Rome* or *London*, or the Image of *Caesar* is *Caesar*, or Bread and Wine is the Body and Blood of Christ] to which, after a little ventilation, that the foregoing is *only a Query*, he will *let it pass for a position*, and adds, 1. *The Scriptures are not that Living and Essential Word*, &c. *But that they may be called the Word, as a Map of* America, *is called* America, *I never denied*, saith he, The more unsound man he, the mean while, say I, especially he having confessed they are no more so, then Bread and Wine are the Body and Blood of Christ: Therefore what he would

Page, 36.

would turn upon us, *viz.* *That if we deny this to be a Truth, we must hold with the Papists*, to bounds upon himself. 2. *That though there is but one Spiritual Baptism, yet that the outward Baptism with Water is also called Baptism, is also true, for* John's *Baptism with Water is called in Scripture the Baptism of* John, saith he. *Answer*, And so there were *divers Washings* (or Baptisms) *and the Doctrine of Baptisms* in those Daies, see *Heb.* 9, 10. and 6. 2. Although the Christians had but *one*, which himself once acknowledged to *J. A.* of *Leith*, when he told him, *We do not say, as the Papists, that there were two Baptisms with Water, one of* John *another of Christ*, *Truths Defence*, p. 124. But now it seems, he can both say it with the Papists and defend it, so uncertain a man is he,

Expostulating with him, I added, Here this *Rabbi*, who once boasted that he hath the gifts both of sound knowledge and Expressions with manifold other Mercies bestowed upon him, hath foiled himself sorely. At this he excepts first against the word *Rabbi*, alledging, *it is in a Scoffing Spirit*, and that it *is the known way of the* Quakers *not to call a Man*, Master. *Answer*, I used it as the Characteristick of what he covets to be, to wit a *Sect Master*, and as such it suits him. His next Cavil p. 37. against the Word [foiled himself sorely] he leaving to the *Intelligent to Judge*, I do so also: Yet is he willing to forestall his Judgment, wherein I shall not imitate him. Then to vindicate those words [sound knowledge, *&c.*] From savouring of Boasting, he alledgeth, that

Page, 37.

to make it look like a Boast, I left out these last words [*for which I desire to Praise him for ever*] and the foregoing, *viz.* [*his being Charged by his Opponent with Marvellous Ignorance, Falshood and Giddiness*] To the first I say, *The Pharisee stood and Prayed thus to himself, God I thank thee, that I am not as other Men*, Luk 18. 11. The Pharisee thanked God: *G. Keith* desired to Praise him for ever. To the second, *Let another Man Praise thee, and not thy own Mouth; a Stranger, and not thy own Lips*, Prov. 27. 2.

He Objects against my calling his Book of *Truth Advanced*, a *Bulky* Book: But this I did not as representing it a bigger Volumn, than many good Men have writ, but that it was *all Bulk*, not to edification, but such gear, as I have given the Reader a taste of already under my second Head.

I now return to his p. 35. where he *alledgeth, that I blame him for Opposing it as an Error, That the Garden of Paradise was some part of this Visible Earth.* [He left out, And that Mans Food both for his Soul and Body was to have been Paradisical] to which he gives no other answer, than some citations and inferences out of *G. W. G. F.* and *W. S.* That *G. W.* and *W. S* have writ against them who have *affirmed, that the forbidden Fruit was an Apple, the Serpent a Creature like our English Snakes, from which Dream of theirs the Picture of a Snake, and an Apple in its Mouth in a Tree, are set up at the beginning of Bibles*, &c. Hence he argues, p. 36. *If the Trees of the Garden were not Visible, and particularly the Tree of the forbidden Fruit, as* Page, 35. Page, 36.

G. W.

G. W. *saith it was not, then to be sure the Garden by his Judgment was not Visible*, &c. *Answer*, It doth not follow that man was not in a Visible Garden any more than it would in the *Metaphor* wherein *Nathan* expressed *David*'s Sin with *Bathsheba*, under the Parable of an *Ew-Lamb*. For as it would be an undue inference that *David*, *Uriah*, &c. Were not Visible Persons upon this Visible Earth, because it would be gross ignorance and darkness to think, *Nathan* spake of a material *Ew-Lamb*; so in this case, it is as absurd to conclude *G. Keith*'s Notions *that the Garden of Paradise was not some part of this Visible Earth, that man*'s *Food before the Fall was to have been Paradisical*, and the Cloathing with *the Skin and Flesh of this Frail, Mortal and corruptible Body*, received but since *the Fall* (as in *Truth Advanced*, p. 16. 18. and 27.) are backed by these Friends, not allowing the gross Interpretation and Conception upon, *Gen.* 3. What he adds out of *G. Fox*'s *Journal* (which he tauntingly calls that *Famous Book*) where it is said, *I was come up in Spirit through the Flaming Sword into the Paradise of God*, is very idle. For as there being a *Mystical Canaan*, doth not imply there never was an *outward* one: So there being a *Mystical Paradise*, doth not imply there never was an *outward Paradise*.

To defend his Exposition of *Adam* and *Eve*'s hiding themselves among the Trees of the Garden, to be in a Tree of the Garden, and that that one Tree may be well understood, to be the divine Mercy or Clemency, whereupon I

replied

replyed, The divine Mercy is in Christ Jesus, and if they were got there, methinks when they heard the Voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden, they should not have been afraid, for they were already safe. *G. Keith* p. 37. after a repeating his having said, *that the Hebrew doth bear it, in a Tree of the Garden,* and a reflecting upon my *ignorance in the Hebrew* (a Language I never pretended Skill in, for it is the application that I mind) adds, *Are they not carnally minded, to think that* Adam *thought he could hide himself, either among the Trees of an outward Garden, or in any one Tree of it, so as God might not see him? Answer, Adams* thoughts I shall not dive into, but if he thought to hide himself from the wrath of God (even in a Tree *of the Garden*, according to *G. Keith*'s Exposition) he found himself mistaken. But how Natural it is for fear and guilt, to take undue and precipitant Courses, which in a sedate frame, they could not propose to be sheltered by, instances in *Isai.* 2. 19. *Hos.* 10. 8. and *Rev.* 6. 15, 16. declare, where men are said, *to go into the Holes of the Rocks, and Caves of the Earth, for Fear of the Lord; to say to the Mountains, Cover us, and to the Hills, Fall on us; to hide themselves in the Dens and Rocks of the Mountains, that they might hide them from the Face of him that sitteth upon the Throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.* Did these men, thinks he, reckon God could not see them there? Or were they not in a Terrour and Amaze, not knowing which way to turn? But he queries, *Doth not the Scripture say, Gods Mercies are over all his works*

Page 37.

and

and doth not the Clemency and Mercy of God extend to them that are not yet in Christ? Answer, But how should man know that, before the Seed (Christ) was promised? For this hiding was an interval between the Fall and the promise. He goes on, p. 38. *Seeing they will needs have this place, where* Adam *hid, some outward Trees on this Earth, by the same Carnal Mind they must understand, that this walking of God, was an outward and bodily walking, and his Voice, an outward and bodily Voice; and so they make not only* Adam, *but* Moses, *who writ these words, to be an* Anthropomorphite *and* Muggletonian. *Answ.* This doth not follow, For *the Lord appeared unto* Abraham *in the Plains of* Mamre, *and he lift up his Eyes, and looked, and lo, three Men stood by him* [was *Moses* an *Anthropomorphite* or *Muggletonian*, for describing the Lord appearing as a Man?] *and he fetcht a Morsel of Bread,* [was not that visible Bread?] See *Gen.* 18. 1, 2, 5. Again, when Christ appeared to *Joshuah, as a Man, as the Captain of the Lord's Host,* Josh. 5. 13, 14. And among the three Children, *as a Man, whose Form,* Nebuchadnezzar *said, was like the Son of God,* Dan. 3. 24, 25. Were these Holy Pen-men *Anthropomorphites* or *Muggletonians?* Or the Plains of *Mamre*, not visible Plains? The *Jericho* mentioned, a *Jericho* in the Air? The Furnace, not a visible Furnace? *Shedrach, Meshach*; and *Abednego*, not visible Men upon this visible Earth? For this is the tendency of his Argument against me.

Page, 38.

In the next place, whereas *G. K.* had assigned it as an Errour to assert, That *Adam* and *Eve* were

were Naked before the Fall, and that their not being ashamed of their Nakedness, did not imply their Innocency but rather their Impudence, I queried, What sign or token of Impudence is it in People, to endeavour to cover their Nakedness? To this *G. Keith* replies, *Taking Nakedness Metaphorically, as I do in that place*, Gen. 2. *As it is taken* Rev. 3. 17. 18. *It is a sign of Impudence to endeavour to cover their Nakedness.* And a little lower, *Is not Sin a Nakedness, Metaphorically taken? And when men cover their Sins, with false and sinful excuses, it is a sign of their Impudence* [and then that he might have an occasion to fling an unproved slander at us, adds] *as is too manifest in* G. W. *and* J. P. *Answer*, No wonder if he be so severe upon us, when he is so uncharitable to our first Parents, as to conclude them impudent Sinners, not ashamed of their Sin, and yet seeking shelter under the divine Mercy: Yet hath he not hitherto proved, that that Nakedness, mentioned *Gen.* 2. 25. Which was before any account of their Fall, was Sin; as well as that he hath not assigned what false excuses they made. He goes on, *What Nakedness was that of the Serpent* [for so he renders, *Gen.* 3. 1. Where the Translation hath it *subtil*] *was it bodily Nakedness?* Answer, If it was Nakedness, it was such a Nakedness as was suitable to him, as a Serpent, as a fallen Angel, even as *Adams* and *Eve*'s Nakedness, was suitable to them as Man and Woman, who as yet had not Transgressed. But he queries again, *Can we suppose, that God who Clothetheth every Lilly of the Field,*

 mad

made Adam *without a suitable Cloathing, Did he not Crown him with Glory and Honour?* Psal. 8. 5. *And if his Head was not Naked, how could his Body be Naked?* *Answer*, This is to confound *Allegorical* with *Literal* things. *Innocency was his covering*, we grant (I suppose) on both hands; but doth this answer the Terms of the proposition, or relate, either to the Covering or Nakedness, whereof the debate is? The like may be said of the Crown of Glory and Honour, *Psal.* 8. 5.

G. Keith having assigned a twofold Cloathing to man after the Fall, *viz.* A Cloathing them inwardly with the Righteousness of the Lamb, and outwardly with the Skin and Flesh of this Frail, mortal and Corruptible Body, I queried, *Did he Cloath them with the Righteousness of the Lamb, and yet at the same time debar them access to the Tree of Life*, See Gen. 3. 21. 22. *What strange Doctrine is this?* Said I, to which he replieth, *At the same time, is their addition.* Answer, In the Relation there is not a verse between. He goes on, *If by the same time they mean the same instant, or hour, I say Nay. But the time was not long betwixt their Fall, and their Restoration, so far as they had access to Christ, signified by the Tree of Life. Answer*, Access to the Tree of Life was not so soon regained; Gods Cloathing them is mentioned, *v.* 21. and after that, *v.* 24. That they were *driven out, and a Flaming Sword placed at the East of the Garden of* Eden, *which turned every Way, to keep the Way of the Tree of Life:* Nor is it probable, that such *impudent Sinners*, as he hath

represented

represented them, could so immediately come at it, that requiring a good Progress, and many good steps to be made, before attained to. To my saying, with respect to the outward Cloathing which he defines to be the Skin and Flesh of this Frail, Mortal and Corruptible Body, *It is Monstruous that we should have a Body a Top of a Body*, he will not allow it to be *his, but my own Invention and Foolish arguing. It a Mass, wherein there is a Mixture of Gold and Dross, a Body a top of a Body*, saith he? *Answer*, The Comparison doth not hold; Man had a Body before the Fall, if this be Cloathed upon, superinduced, then not a Mixture or Compound, as in Gold and Dross. The Cloaths we put on, are no part of our Bodies, and that this Cloathing which *Adam* had after the Fall, was not *proper to Man as Man*, himself hath said, *Truth Advanced*, p. 113. What is it then less than a Body a top of a Body?

What I had cited out of him, *Truth Advanced*, p. 28. (of Man and Womans being made Back to Back before the Fall, and afterwards split or divided into two Sides or Halves, the effect of their Fall being such, that they could not multiply their Species in one Body, without the Separation, as they mought have done, if the Fall had not been, *&c.*) He wholly waves touching only upon my *quarrelling* (as he phraseth it) *with his rendering Rib to be Side. Answer*, I should hardly think it worth my while to dispute it with him, whether it were best Translated *Rib* or *Side*, but that his *Chimera*, of their being made Back to Back, *&c.*

Depends thereon. Hear then what the Scripture ſaith, *The Lord God took one of his Ribs*, Gen. 2. 21. *And the Rib, which the Lord God had taken from Man, made he a Woman*, v. 22. *And* Adam *ſaid, This is now Bone of my Bones, and Fleſh of my Fleſh, ſhe ſhall be called Woman, becauſe ſhe was taken out of Man*, v. 23. *Qu.* How could ſhe be Bone of his Bones, and taken out of Man, if never in him, but only joyned to him? *Therefore ſhall a Man leave his Father*, &c. *And they ſhall be one Fleſh*, v. 24. Qn. If they had grown together, and been Created twain, Back to Back, why is it ſaid, they ſhall be one Fleſh? But that it had reſpect, not to a Splitting aſunder, even to a diſtinct formation (in the Margin it is *Builded*, v. 22.) not a ſeparation, ſomthing taken out of Man; whereon the Lord had beſtowed Workmanſhip, not barely a healing where the cleaving Inſtrument had gone? Thus I leave it with the Reader, whether *Moſes* or *G. Keith* be ſoundeſt in the Expreſſion of this great Work of the Creator,

What he adds againſt *G. Whitehead* his *calling*
Page 39. G. Keith's *proceedings arbitrary and Extrajudicial, new Court of Judicatory*, &c. (They relating to his Summons to meet him at *Turners-Hall*, and yet barely Exhibiting a general charge, without Mentioning out of what Books and Pages they were deduced) I paſs by, as what hath been anſwered over and over, particularly in my REFLECTIONS and the Paper called REASONS, *&c.* For the reſt he giving a general reference to his *Narrative*, I ſhall as generally

generally refer to the *Answer* to it, and for his Notion of the Resurrection, to what I have already offered, under the Second Head, out of *Truth Advanced*, p. 113. 116, 127. Where his *Husk* or *Drossy part* exceeds the more *Noble*.

To his putting us in mind of 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. I say, The reason of our hope we have given, and that in the most publick manner, even to himself: We need not go into Corners (as all hearing is in comparison of the Press) to do it over again, especially he being Debtor still to two of *T. Ellwood*'s, and mine called *the Apostate Exposed*: Therefore he may save his Labour in making offers to us, to *appoint time and place, and he will meet us*; for we are before hand with him, his Books not sticking upon our Hands unanswered, as ours do upon his.

And now I come to take notice of the first part of his Book (called *Antichrists and Sadducees Detected*, &c.) levelled against a Book of *Caleb Pusey*'s, stiled *A Modest Account of the principal Differences in point of Doctrine between Geo. Keith and the People called Quakers*, &c.) whereto he would entitule me, from my recommending him, that it lay at his Door unanswered, and the Second Daies Meeting at *London*, from their approving it. With them he begins, p. 3. And I shall Consider what he saith thereof, when I come to answer his *Postscript*, where it more Naturally falls in.

What relates to matter of fact, of things transacted beyond Sea, as they who were privy

thereto, are most Capable of answering, so shall leave it to them to do, if they see cause, and begin with what he Objects against *C. Pusey*

Page 4. *concerning the sufficiency of the Light.* The words (which the Friend began with, p. 8.) were taken out of *G. Keith's Universal Grace*, p. 117, *viz.* 'That the Knowledge of him, as in the 'outward, is of necessity unto Salvation, we 'grant not [and it followed in the Book itself, save only where it is revealed, *&c.*] Here *G. Keith* seeks to creep out, by the Terms *Express Knowledge and Belief*, (which he saith *is not universally of absolute necessity unto Salvation*, That thus *R. B. saith* (but he tells not where) and himself in the place above. *Answer*, The Knowledge is spoken of Indefinitely, in that assertion (and when the words, *Express and distinct Knowledge* are afterwards added, it is from the Terms of our Adversaries whose Objection he cites) but he useth not those Terms in his own position, or as explanatory thereof. For he is positive that the Knowledge of Christ in the outward (he saith not the Explicit or Implicit Knowledge; but the Knowledge) is not of absolute necessity to Salvation, save only where revealed.

In the very same Page, he saith, *When he states the difference in point of Doctrine between some in* Pennsilvania *and me, as if I said, it was an Error to affirm, the Light within were sufficient without something else*, &c. From whence at the close of the Paragraph, he concludeth, *To exclude the Man Christ without us, and his Death*, &c. *From being Concerned in our Salvation*

But herein he wrongs *C. Pusey* who neither states their belief, nor his undue inference, but only opposeth *G. Keith* to *G. Keith* where, upon *R. Gordons*, saying, *that the declaring the Light and Power and Spirit within to be Christ the only Mediator and Saviour, asserts another Christ, another Saviour than* Jesus *of* Nazareth, *G. Keith* tells him, *If thou wert indeed for this Mystery Christ within, as he is the Seed, the Light, the Power and the Life, thou wouldst not say this asserts another Christ.* This the Friend, in his p. 9. quoted out of *G, Keith*'s *Light of Truth*, p. 8. which is cogent: But what is this to a stating a point of difference in *Pennsilvania*, or in inferring that they exclude Christ without us, his Death, *&c.* From being concerned in our Salvation? It shews indeed *G. Keith*'s Contradiction to himself (& as such it was brought) one while to say, Declaring the Light within to be the only Mediator and Saviour, asserts another Christ than *Jesus* of *Nazareth*; another while that it doth not so: And that was all *C. Pusey* deduced therefrom, which *G. Keith* would pervert to a sense never given, nor intended, in order to mislead his Reader and extricate himself.

In the next place comes a Citation out of *G. Keith*'s Book, called *Refutation*, &c. (which was Printed, I suppose in *Pennsilvania*, and I have sought for here, but cannot get sight of) wherein *G. Keith* Charges the Friend with *Base Forgery*. When *G. Whitehead* had in softer terms expreſt *G. Keith*'s *unfairness* (he did not say *base Forgery*) in leaving out the word

[Blood and Bones] which if inserted had turned *G. Keith*'s Cavil out of Doors, *G. Keith* had a Plaister at Hand, imputing it, p. 39. to an *oversight, either in the Print, or Transcript* (it seems he could not tell which, and that he writes by guess) But now he will allow nothing to either. But observe how he makes good his Charge of Forgery. *See the place*, saith he, *I have no such words, but plain Contrary*, and then refers not to the Page the Friend brought, which was *Refutation*. p. 38, 39. But to another, *viz.* p. 42, 43. And in that other the words given have no affinity with what the Friend alledged. The passage out of *G. Keith* in the Friends Book was thus, [It is a real degree of Blasphemy to say, this Light cannot make satisfaction for Sins past] in G. *Keith*'s quotation [neither is the Saints greatest inward Righteousness or Holiness wrought in them by the Spirit of God, an attonement for their Sins, but Christ alone, who dyed for us, the just for the unjust] Is it likely that one of these places should be mistaken for the other? Nay they speak not of one thing; one speaks of the *Worker*, the Light; the other of the *Work wrought*, the Saints' Righteousness. He might well enough say both, for they do not Contradict one another: But such pittiful shifts is G. *Keith* put to, to defend his weak cause against a *despised* Miller, which a *true Brit. Scholiar* would Scorn.

To *Caleb Pusey*'s shewing *G. K.* had said *Magistrates may Preach*, and opposing thereto his saying, *Preachers may not be Magistrates*, he

repli

replies, *This is no Contradiction, for it is one thing occasionally to Preach, or Teach, or Exhort, as any Christian can do, and another to Exercise the Office or Function of a Minister of the Gospel of Peace one day, that saith, Resist not evil, and our Weapons are not Carnal, and another day to Hang Men for Murder. Answ.* Occasionally to Preach is a distinction *occasionally* made to creep out at. The Office, Function, and Salary of such a Ministry as distinguisheth the *Clergy* from the *Laity*, he may perhaps now Court; but he was of another Mind once, when he wrote his Book, called, *The Woman Preacher of* Samaria, Printed *Anno* 1674. where in the very Title Page, he asserts she was *a better Preacher, and more sufficiently qualified to Preach, than any of the Man-made Ministry in these Three Nations*, and in his page 1. opposeth that Notion, That *Women should not be Preachers*, nor *meddle with their Holy Function*, and throughout the Book labours to prove her Call, Qualifications, Success, Experimental Preaching, *&c.* to be more immediate, more edifying, more free, than such as had the Ordination from Man: Yet was she but what he now stileth an *Occasional Preacher*. But to come to the Second Branch of the Objection, May these Occasional Preachers be Magistrates? May they resist Evil? May their Weapons be Carnal? (May they Hang Men for Murder? For that he foisteth in to the Premises, to make a noise) or do the Preachers Preach that Doctrine to be put in practice by none but themselves? If so, none were to be Christians but themselves, and then a Man, who is a Christian, ceaseth

ceaseth to be a Magistrate, as well that a Magistrate ceaseth to be a Christian. I hope by this time the Reader will see whither Prejudice hath driven him, thus to lay down a Position, destructive to Government, and shaking the Basis of all well-regulated Magistracy among Christians, as if it were Ordained of God, *for the punishment of evil doers, and the praise of them that do well*, 1 Pet. 2. 14. only among the *Gentiles*, and Christ's Followers must run into *Anarchy* and Confusion.

He goes on, endeavouring to reconcile his saying, (*Way Cast up*, p. 131.) *It is no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, but a Pure, Æthereal or Heavenly Body*, to another saying of his, *That it remaineth the same in Substance that it was on Earth*, &c. by distinguishing between the *Flesh that is mortal, gross and corruptible*, and the *Flesh that is immortal and incorruptible*. *Answ.* How can it be the same in Substance, when the Substance is not the same? Was the Substance, when on Earth, no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, but Æthereal and Heavenly? Or is Æthereal and Heavenly, the same in Substance, with a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bone? How is this reconcileable?

To his positively denying the express Knowledge of Christs becoming Man, and Suffering, *&c.* to be of Necessity to Salvation, the Friend queried, How is it now, that he saith, that express Knowledge is indispensibly necessary to Salvation, or perfect Justification, for which they both quote *Presbyterian* and *Independent Churches*, p. 133. and *G. Keith* replieth, p. 5.

Page 5.

His

His fallacy lyeth in this, that I say, the express Knowledge is not universally necessary, but some Knowledge, if not express, yet implicite, is, and this (he saith) *is no Contradiction. Answ.* That Page hath nothing in it of that tendency, but what is, is in p. 111, 112. So that the Mistake in *C. Pusey*'s Book, in *Print* or *Transcript*, *G. Keith* hath followed in his, without amending it. This *G. Keith* did either espy, or he did not espy. If he did espy it, why not also give warning of it, except he designed to lead his Reader Hoodwinkt, that he might impose upon him? If he did not espy it, how could he pretend to detect a fallacy, in what he had not compared? Take it either way, it makes not for *G. Keith*'s Credit. Now to return to the Quotation, the *fallacy* is in *G. Keith*; for as the Question was concerning Salvation and PERFECT Justification, so the Assertion whence it was deduced, was thus, 'It may be very 'safely concluded that the express Knowledge 'and Faith of Christ crucified, is not of abso-'lute and indispensible Necessity, unto the BE-'GINNING of a Mans Salvation, although it 'is really of absolute and indispensible Necessi-'ty unto the finishing and PERFECTING of 'it, said *G. Keith*, *Presbyterian* and *Independent* '*Churches*, p. 111. By this the Reader may give a guess, why *G. Keith* was willing to shelter himself under a mispaged Quotation; for had the place been examined, it would have discovered the Friends Inference to have been genuine, restricted not to *some Knowledge* indefinitely, but to a *saving* and *perfecting* Knowledge.

ledge. And if any pleaſe to trace him yet further, they will find it was ſuch a Knowledge, as who had not, WHEN LIVING, might (according to *G. Keith*) have *at their Death, to wit, in the paſſing through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, according to* Pſalm 23. 4. *Even when they are not able to demonſtrate unto the Living, what is then revealed unto them*, See *Presbyterian* and *Independent Churches*, p. 112. Which as it is a perverſe Expoſition of that Scripture, (*David* ſpeaking there of a Condition here upon Earth, *The Lords preparing a Table for him in the preſence of his Enemies, anointing his Head with Oyl*, &c. *So that Goodneſs and Mercy ſhall follow him all the days of his Life*; ver. 5, and 6. Not of a State after Death, when Men are not able to demonſtrate unto the Living, what is then revealed unto them) ſo it renders him a Favourer of the Notion of *Purgatory*; as well as that it is worſe than miſapplying Scriptures to prove certain Truths, which thoſe places did not prove (an Error he would pretend to have Retracted, p. 35.) this tending to defend *untruths*, and unſound Notions, which the Scriptures do diſavow.

Upon *C. Puſey* his querying, 'Seeing, according to *G. Keith*, he is not only the true 'Chriſt, who was manifeſt in the Body of Fleſh, 'but alſo as manifeſt in us, how is it then, 'that he that is manifeſt in us, is ſomething 'elſe than he that was manifeſt in that Body 'of Fleſh, ſeeing, IN BOTH RESPECTS, he 'is ſo confeſſed to be the only true Chriſt and 'Saviour. And ſurely the Word [only] is alone,

alone, and admits of nothing else. Thus far the Friend. Hereupon *G. Keith* citing him only, from where he saith [the Word only] infers, that *he placeth all on the Light within, so that the Man Christ Jesus of* Nazareth *without us is nothing of Christ*, and calls it a *blasphemous Assertion and Consequence, which follows not from his Words. Answ.* The Friend gave *G. Keith* his Words, not his own, which as I have stated more fairly than himself hath done, I leave with the Reader, whether the Consequence be forced, not natural, or whether it proveth, that the Friend placeth all on the Light within, nothing on *Jesus* of *Nazareth* without us. Or whether *G. Keith* had ground from hence to insult, that his Opponent *had neither Learning nor good Exercise of humane Reason, but had better kept working at his Mill?* as well as that I may put *G. Keith* in Mind what he once said, that 'a *Docta Ignorantia*, or a learned Ignorance is more safe, and to be preferred to an 'uncertain Knowledge or Science falsly, so called. See *Truths Defence*, p. 77.

G. Keith goes on, *Seeing that he would infer from my Words, That* Jesus *of* Nazareth *cannot be something else than the Light, Power and Spirit within, it is plain, that it is both their Sense and his, that* Jesus *of* Nazareth *is nothing at all of Christ without us, which is a plain Contradiction to themselves, and to himself in the following Words.* Thus far *G. Keith.* But how will he prove our Sense and his to be, that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* is nothing at all of Christ without us, if that sense be so immediately Contradicted in the fol-

following words? This shews he wants *candour*, and would take things by the *worst* handle, to fasten an imputation, not only upon the Friend himself, but his Brethren also, which he confesseth is contradicted by him: Who, had he not sought an occasion to misrepresent us mought have entituled *us at least*, to what he calls the contradictory Sense. Now *C. Pusey* his Words were these, upon *G. Keith*'s saying, *The Light is Christ, but the Man Christ is something else*, he queried, *Whether the Man Christ be become something else besides Christ?* And adds, *but to wave such Comparisons*, which shews his were not *Assertory*, but *argumentative ad hominem*, i Comparison *G. Keith* drew him to. To this I say, The Man Christ, who *was made* (or became) *Flesh*, John 1. 14. who said of himself, *I am come a Light into the World*, Chap. 12. *ver.* 46. is not something else besides Christ. And seeing himself hath said, *Way cast up*, p. 102. *That it is not the outward Flesh and Blood that is the Man, but the Soul, or inward Man that dwelleth in the outward Flesh or Body, that is the Man most properly, such as Christ was even from the beginning.* I ask, Whether the Man Christ, that was even from the beginning, be become something else besides Christ? And seeing God hath said, *I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour*, Isa. 43. 11. Whether this infers a denial of what Christ (who is the Light) did and suffered without us in that prepared Body, *&c.*

And that the Friend himself did not believe that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* is nothing at all of Christ

with

without us, as unduly aſperſed by *G. Keith*, hear him in his *Modeſt Account*, p. 16, 17. where he thus hath it, 'Though we cannot yield to 'G. *Keith* in theſe his Terms, That the Light 'is not able of it ſelf, and conſequently, that 'God (by *G. Keith*'s own Words, who ſaith 'the Light is God) is not able to ſave, be-'cauſe we believe, *Beſide him there is no Saviour*, 'yet we do not in the leaſt Queſtion, but dear-'ly own and acknowledge and believe the Way 'and Means, that the Lord was pleaſed, out of 'his infinite Love and good Will to Mankind, 'to take, in order to redeem him from Sin and 'Death, as ſending his only begotten Son into 'the World, not only as a Light — but alſo as 'Man, in the prepared Body to offer up him-'ſelf a moſt acceptable Sacrifice for the Sins 'of the whole World, which Offering the Lord 'was pleaſed to accept of, and by his Spirit 'and Power it is made Effectual for the Recon-'ciliation and Salvation of all thoſe that repent 'of their Sins, and truly believe in his Name. 'And that God doth not ſave any without re-'ſpect to that great Offering, we all grant and 'truly believe, *&c.* This as it is a full Vindi-cation of the Friend, that he did not underva-lue, but highly prize what Chriſt hath done without us; ſo it needs no further Comment, than a Reflection upon his Adverſaries Diſin-genuity, who kept this back, while he labou-red to ſuggeſt the contrary thereto, as the Friends ſenſe and ours.

He ſaith further, *He* [*C. Puſey*] *ſo mingles my words with his own, that no Man can diſtin-*

guiſh

guish the one from the other, &c. And I think he is unwilling rightly to distinguish, that he may pervert them. For whereas the Friend had said, [And that God doth not save any without respect to that great Offering, we all grant and truly believe: For, as *G. Keith* saith, The Lord having ordained it so to be, how can or dare we say therefore, That he was or is not Sufficient, by his Light, Power and Spirit, to save without something else? Surely this seems to me too Presumptuous an Expression; for was not that Body prepared of God? And what was done in it? Is it not said, God did it by him?] *G. Keith* in p. 6. leaving out [And that God, *&c.*] and beginning with [For as G. Keith saith] lays *Forgery* to the Friends Charge, as if [*having ordained*] *related* not to God's saving by that great Offering, but to the following *Query*, *Concerning the Sufficiency of the Light*, which is a poor insult. From hence he taketh occasion to infer the *Necessity of God's Saving by Christ, and that he could not save us without respect to the Man Christ in the outward, otherwise he could or should contradict his own Ordination*, &c. which is granted him, even by the Friend. But *whether antecedently to God's purpose, he would have saved us without the Death of his own Dear Son, a thing* (he tells us *Exact Narrative*, p. 25.) *is above Mans Capacity*, and that *he wholly waves that Dispute*, is what I shall wave insisting on, yet with this Caution, which the Friend also gave him in his, p. 18. *viz.* 'Let us not undertake to argue, as if there 'were any thing, that God by his Light, Spi-

Page 6.

'ri-

'rit and Power, is not *sufficient* to do, and we 'need not debate any longer about it.

What follows, relating to Matter of Fact transacted beyond Sea, whereof I can pretend to no certain Knowledge, and their Relations do so vary, I must leave to the Persons concerned to Answer, if they see meet, not being willing to undertake a Defence of what I am not Privy to, nor to justify them, if in ought they have exceeded, though I dare not trust his Evidence. Yet his alledging that *he Printed nothing about their retaking a sloop, till a considerable Time after twenty eight of the Ministers had excommunicated him, to which Sentence, some that gave the Commission did put their Hands*, is a plain Intimation, what animated him, not a concern for God and his Truth, so much as Revenge and Malice.

In p. 7. G. Keith acknowledgeth he said in one Book (this is quoted *Presbyterian and Independent Churches*, p. 133. and should be p. 111.) *The express Knowledge of Christs Death and Sufferings, as Man in the outward, is not universally necessary to Salvation*, but that he hath said, *That the express Knowledge of Christs Death, is universally necessary*, he alledgeth, *C. Pusey gives no Passage in any of his Books. Answ.* Himself hath acknowledged in that very Book, *Presbyterian and Independent Churches*, p. 111. That the express Knowledge is universally necessary to the perfecting of Salvation and Justification, and in p. 112. hath allotted them, when it must be, *viz.* not when living, but afterwards, and the same he saith here, thus, *I* Page, 7.

never had any Controversie with any, saith he, *whether the express Knowledge and Faith of Christs Death and Sufferings, be universally necessary to Mans Salvation, so as necessary to be had by all and every one before Death.* Thus *incidit in Scyllam, qui vult vitare Charybdim:* To get off from a Contradiction, he recurs to what will include the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, or *Revolutionism*, for if not before Death, then after Death: And when then? In their Passage through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, as instanced above? Or in a renewed Visitation and Re-animation? The former shakes Hands with the Papists, the latter with the Revolutionists.

But the true State of the Question between them and me, was and is, saith G. Keith, *Whether the express Knowledge and Faith of Christs Death, Sufferings*, &c. *be not necessary to Salvation to all professing Christianity, and who have the opportunity, and help of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament*, &c. *Answ.* What he calls the true State of the Question is denied by them, particularly by *S. J.* (*State of the Case*, p. 11.) to be any Question at all, as well as that it is against our known Principle, to call in Question the Necessity of the Faith of Christs Death and Sufferings, where the means of having it is afforded.

Page 8. What *C. Pusey* relates from p. 24, to 28. G. Keith Terms *base Insinuations against him, about the twelve Revolutions, and telling some Stories, most of which are*, if we will believe G. Keith, *absolutely false, and that little that is true, not fairly nor duly related, and for which no Proof is brought in*

but his own forfeited Credit, &c. p. 8. *Answ.* This is too general. What are those Stories? Which of them absolutely false? Which in Part true? And in what Part true, in what unfairly related? If the Friend have *forfeited his Credit*, I am sure G. *Keith* goes not the way to *gain* his. However one of the Relations I shall transcribe, which was, 'That G. *Keith* told *Ebenezer Slocam* of *Rhoad Island*, as he affirms, to this purpose, That it was Gods great Mercy to the *Jebusites*, *Amorites*, *and Hittites* of Old, in that he destroyed them so much at once by the *Israelites*, for that by so doing, their Souls might be sooner come into the Bodies of the *Jews* Children, and so consequently become the sooner to be Members of the Visible Church, *&c.* See *Modest Account*, p. 7. If this be one of the Stories he hath ought material to object against, it had highly behoved him, instead of passing it over in silence, to have declared whether false in the whole, or in Part: or if this be true, his leaning to the Doctrine of the twelve Revolutions, is undeniable; as well as his sliding so lightly over it, gives a strong Presumption, that he hath spoken to that Effect.

His next Essay to clear himself from having indicated us and our Doctrine to *C. Mather* in *New England*, is as unsuccessful. He saith, *was before that Party rose up against him in Pennsilvania to oppose the same Doctrine he delivered in his Printed Books — that he was astonisht to see how suddenly they turned against the very same Doctrine, after* W. Stockdale *had accused him*

of Preaching two Christs — and finding G. Whitehead *and* W. Penn *to favour and support them, he found sufficient cause to change his Judgment concerning those Men*, p. 8, 9. *Answ.* This will not shelter him, for his complaint against *W. Stockdale* (which had had a hearing before Friends, and they for the most Part excused and defended him, as G. *Keith* alledgeth) was by himself again laid before Friends of the Ministry at their Yearly Meeting in *Pennsylvania* in the seventh Month, 1691. See *Plea*, p. 2, and 3. whereas the Book in Answer to *Mather* (called *Serious Appeal*) was Printed Anno, 1692. This shews as if the Man would boggle at nothing to excuse himself, who had in that Book defended our Friends in *America* as well as here from being *Heretical* or *Blasphemous*. Alike successful is he in what he alledgeth against G. *Whitehead* and *W. Penn*: Those very Books out of which he and others (in their Book called *Christian Faith*) have brought instances to convince our Opposers of the soundness of our Principles, hath G. Keith since offered to prove unsound in those very Principles. This is not changing his Judgment of Men only, but even of Books.

Page, 9 His next Paragraph p. 9. is about the Doctrine of the Revolutions, in which he dodgeth extreamly, one while representing it as such which from two Passages out of G. *Fox*, in the one he mentions neither Book nor Page, but saith it is *in some of his Printed Books*; in the other he gives the Book (*viz.* the *Journal*) and not the Page, he saith *hath occasioned some*

to think G. Fox *favoured the Revolutions*, and adds, *but I do not say he did* (Query, Did he not know he did not?) Which shews the Man doth not know what he would be at; for if not sufficient, from his lame Quotations to fasten that Doctrine upon *G. Fox*, why did he bring them? Another while he renders it a Question, *Whether the Disciples did not hold that Doctrine, that said Master, who hath sinned, this Man or his Servants*, [he should have said Parents] *that he was born Blind*, and adds, *many other Places of Scripture there are on which he might as much and much more query concerning the Revolutions, as any Expressions he hath mentioned mine.* But all this is trifling, if he can prove that Doctrine of the Revolutions by Scripture, let him avow it to be his, and do so. He who hath told us, that it is only safe to keep close to Scripture Words and Terms, will he not do himself? But what the Friend offered, to prove that Notion to be his, *G. Keith* gives it but in a general Reference to p. 24, 25, of the Friends Book, till he comes to the Instance of an *Indian* and *poor Infant*. Now *C. Mather* in his p. 25, 26. had argued thus, 'If they could not perish, though they dyed without Faith and Knowledge, and yet that Faith and Knowledge is absolutely necessary to *perfect* their Salvation, where must they have that Faith and Knowledge, unless they come again to receive it? And if they do, what will become of that Text (*Eccles.* 11. 13.) brought by *G. Keith* against the *New-England* Professors? Now according to this Text, brought

'by *G. Keith* himself, if an honest *Indian* or
'poor Infant, dye or fall without that out-
'ward Knowledge, so they must lye. And
'then if they cannot be perfectly saved with-
'out it, then their lying must be but as Souls
'saved in Part, and that to be their State for-
'ever, because, as they fall, so they lye. Thus
far *C. Pusey* which *G. Keith* wholly waves
quoting only from [If an honest *Indian*, &c.
and goes no further than the Word [outward
Knowledge] which yet it had become him to
have answered, if he could But what he does
cite, he is soon weary of, and catching at the
Term *outward Knowledge*, having left out what
would have explained it, he saith, *I never af-
firmed the absolute Necessity of an outward Know-
ledge, universally to Salvation, besides that prope-
ly all Knowledge is inward, and not outward, the sub-
ject of it being the Mind and Understanding that
inward.* *Answ.* This is poor shifting, I might
as well say, all Knowledge properly is expre
not implicite, what is implicite being hidden
not revealed or made known (*kept secret*, as
himself phrasith it) but he plaies upon Words
to slide off from the Matter; for the Mill
hath ground him. He knows the Knowledge
they were treating of, was such as *G. Keith*
himself defined to be necessary to the perfec-
ing Salvation, a Knowledge *G. Keith* hath al-
lowed they had not, when living; and the
the Reader would have perceived, had not
Keith curtailed the Quotation: And therefore
his Cavil is as idle as evasive.

Havi

Having thus toſſed off the Friends query and argument, he betaketh himſelf to retorting' *I return his own query* (ſaith he) *upon him to answer, What becomes of them when they Dye, ſeeing without being Born again, there is no entring into the Kingdom of God, and what becomes of many Quakers, and others, that before they dyed, had no ſigns that they were arrived at that high ſtate of Sinles perfection, as attainable by the Grace of God in this Life.* And adds, *Let him tell me, or any for him, what becomes of ſuch when they Dye, and I may give him the like Anſwer, or ſome better, what becomes of honeſt* Indians, *when they Dye*, p. 9. 10. And then he would make up an Anſwer for us, which yet he confeſſeth, we *blame when given by others* (ſo ready is he to beſpatter us at any rate) *as if they who are in meaſure Sanctified*, &c. *Are made perfect in Holineſs at the inſtant of Death*, &c. But we have no need to recurr to this Notion, that of Purgatory or of Revolutioniſm to defend our Principles, though he ſeem at laſt willing to allow, it is not altogether improbable, ſaying, *It hath the ſame Probability in the one Caſe, as the other*, to ſlide himſelf off from the imputation of Revolutioniſm. And although he hath ſo frequently ſtigmatized us, as denyers of the univerſal benefit accruing to mankind, by that one offering of our Lord Jeſus; yet I ſhall tell him, that even herein we aſcribe more thereto than he doth, who acknowledge that the Penitent, who Dye not arrived to that Maturity, which a more full improvement of their Talent mought have produced, receive

Page, 10.

an advantage by Christs Death and Sufferings, *viz.* That a *Propitiation* is thereby made for their Sins, and not for theirs only, but also for the Sins of the whole World, 1 *John* 2. 2. So that they Dying in a state of Salvation, and Renovation, their Sins are blotted out, *Acts*, 3. 19. which none of the finally obdurate and impenitent, partake of: So that there is no necessity of Pleading for Sin, Term of Life, or for a Purgation at the instant of Death, in Purgatory, or a Succeeding Revolution, but *on him* (the Advocate) *is help laid*, Psal. 89. 19. Thus he may see I do not shift and boggle in my Answers, my cause being such as is not ashamed to shew its Head, whatever his is, that drives such a man as *G. Keith* (who so overvalues himself upon his School-Learning, and so undervalues others for want of it) to such mean and pitiful Subterfuges.

C. Pusey having shewed him a Contradiction, in one while saying, *That which riseth is the Mortal that puts on Immortality and the Corrutible that putteth on Incorruption*, and again, *The Flesh that is Mortal and Corruptible, is not that Flesh*, that shall be raised *up Immortal and Incorruptible* (See *Testimony against that absurd Opinion*, p. 3. and 10.) 'If that which riseth 'be the Corruptible, how is it that that which 'riseth is Incorruptible, and Corrupteth not 'again? Thus far the Friend to which *G. Keith* replies, *He quarrels not so much with me, as with the Scriptures*, 1 Cor. 15. 53. and *v.* 50. *Answer*, What *Paul* speaks of the Bodies sown, *G. Keith* applies to the Bodies raised, that he

might

might make the Scriptures as self-Inconsistent, as himself is: It was *sown in Corruption, in Dishonour, in Weakness, a Natural Body; raised in Incorruption, in Glory, in Power, a Spiritual Body*; See, *v.* 42, 43, 44, But *Paul* doth not say, That which riseth is the Mortal, and then again, The Flesh that is Mortal, *&c.* Is not the Flesh that shall be raised Immortal, as *G. Keith* hath done.

To Vindicate his other assertion, *viz. That which riseth is a pure, Noble part that Consumeth not, he bringeth in the Similitude of a Grain of* Corn, p. 11. thus, *All but Fools and Idiots know, that as there is a Grain of Corn that Corrupteth, and turneth to Earth or Dust, so there is another part in it, that is more noble, that Corrupteth not, but by the Corruption of the other part——Gets a new Life. Answer*, This Simile will not hold, even among them that are not Fools & Idiots, for that very noble part may Corrupt, and the Industrious Husband Man have no Crop, as G. *Keith* himself, who is neither Fool nor Idiot, allows, in the very same page. Again, that more noble part in the Seed, is proper to the Seed, as Seed: And the less noble is a necessary Appendix to the more noble, which is not so in this Case, G *Keith* himself being Judge. For Man had a Body before the Fall, that Body had its radix (else how could it *multiply its Speices*, according to G *Keith* in *Truth Advanced*, p. 28.) the which Body G. *Keith* saith, was not Naked before the Fall, ibid, p. 24. On the other hand the Skin and Flesh of this Frail, Mortal and Corruptible Body, he saith, is

Page, 11.

is not proper to Man as Man, but a Cloathing he received ſince the Fall, See, ibid. p. 113. and 27. But is this predicable of a Grain of Corn? So that all his noiſe of *Sadduceiſm*, *Atheiſm*, &c. Terminates in a diſpute whether the Man's Cloaths ſhall riſe or no? *viz.* That which, according to him, is not proper to Man as Man, not ſo much as to his Cloathing before the Fall, but was added by means of tranſgreſſion? A Reſurrection of the Body, of ſuch a Body as God ſhall pleaſe to give, we own, and that he knows full well; but his uncertain, Wavering, Notional, Abſurd, Incongruous, and Unſcriptual Expoſitions we reject (as particularly what he ſaid even now, that *that which riſeth is the Mortal*, and yet again, *that which riſeth is a pure noble part, that conſumeth not*) and this makes him uneaſy.

As a further Indication of his inſtability, let us hear what *true Philoſophy*, *right Reaſon*, *and ocular Experience teacheth*, as himſelf giveth it us, *viz.* *The Generation of one thing followeth the Corruption of another, yet there is ſomething in the new Generated thing, that was in the old Corrupted thing*, &c. Whence I query, Whether this SOMETHING in the new generated thing, which was in the Old Corrupted thing, be that which riſeth *Mortal* and *Corruptible*, as he ſaid even now? For if Mortal and Corruptible, how comes it to be a pure noble part, which conſumeth not, nor corrupteth, with the old Corrupted thing? Are theſe Terms convertible? That predicable of the one, which is of the other? Or is it not rather a demon-

ſtration

ſtration; that in ſtead of being taught by true *Philoſophy*, &c. He is now Plunged into the *Ditch* of Philoſophy, as he called it, whence this blind Leader of the Blind cannot help himſelf out? As well as that theſe Sentiments, whereby the Fleſh, Blood and Bones are Termed the Old Corrupted thing, that the New Generation hath not; but only SOMETHING that was in it, (*The Fleſh that is Mortal and Corruptible*, being by him denied to be *the Fleſh that ſhall be raiſed up Immortal and Incorruptible*, p. 10.) do no ways accord with thoſe of thoſe, whom he now appeals to, againſt us; and would ſhelter himſelf among, for they aſſert the Reſurrection of the ſame Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, that Dyed and was laid in the Grave; he here denieth it. So that after all his quarrelling with us, rendring us *Atheiſts*, *Sadducees*, &c. And Labouring to Provoke the Government againſt us, to ſuppreſs our Books; himſelf is no leſs *Erroneous* and *Heretical* (while *abiding* by what he here ſaith) to their received Opinion of the Reſurrection, than we are, when our belief is rightly ſtated.

Upon *G. Keith* his diſtinction of *Commutation* and *Tranſmutation*, with reſpect to Body and Soul, the Friend argues, firſt, with reſpect to the Body, thus, 'If the Corruptible be laid 'aſide, and that which Corrupteth not, but is 'ſeparated (as *G. Keith* ſaith) in about a Years 'time, more or leſs, and laid by divine Pro'vidence in ſome certain Inviſible place, till 'the Reſurrection; How then doth it receive 'the change meant by him in the Text, at the Reſur-

'Resurrection? *viz.* If it be Incorruptible 'before the Resurrection (for he saith, it Cor- 'rupteth not) and the Change must be a Trans- 'mutation from one thing to another; must it 'not then needs be from an Incorruptible Bo- 'dy to an Incorruptible Body, and what change 'is that? For if it be a Transmutation, what 'is it which is Transmuted? It cannot be the 'noble and pure part, because the Apostle 'saith, *It is our Vile Body*, and according to *G.* '*Keith*, it cannot be that which Corrupteth, 'because he saith, That which riseth, Cor- 'rupteth not. Thus far *C. Pusey* p. 32. 33. which G. *Keith* gives not his Reader, though he makes his perverse inference therefrom, saying of his Opponent, *He cannot conceive how there can be an Incorruptible part lodged or placed in the Corruptible Body, and how the Body can have any Incorruptible part in it before the Resurrection*, &c.* To which I answer, The debate is not about an Incorruptible part, being lodged in a Corruptible Body; but what that is that is changed, whether the vile Body, or that which Corrupteth not; and again, whether seeing a Transmutation must be from one thing to another, what Change is that, from an Incorruptible Body to an Incorruptible Body? So that he hath, to avoid the force of the argument, not only not given the Citation, but mis-stated it, and then insults, saying, *shall I send him to his Mill, or own Trade of Grinding, or Sawing Timber, for further Instruction?* And yet this Miller hath ground him so, he cannot get fairly off.

And

And therefore, in the next place let us examine G. Keith his Philosophy, *When a Man eateth Corn with the Husk, and swalloweth down at least a good quantity of the Husk or Bran, together with the Food that is mixed with it, doth the Husk become any Part of his Body? Or rather, doth it not belong to the excrement, with other gross parts of the Food*, saith he, 'p. 12. I answer by way of retortion, the Swine that feed on Husk only, and the Prodigal Son who did the like; if all went into excrement, and none into nourishment, what did they live on? He saith again, *Is there not in all Food one more noble part that becometh not excrement, but is Transmuted into real Flesh, in Man?* But the Husk being not allowed by him to be the more noble part, I ask, What is Transmuted into real Flesh, where the Food is only Husk? Yet he so values himself upon his *Excrementitious* and *Husky* Philosophy, that hence he further argues, *Did not what our Saviour Eat, turn into his [illegible]l Flesh, and become Incorruptible?*— *And was not his Body of Flesh yet further changed after his Resurrection?* &c. And then he tells us for whose *sake he Traces this Ignorant Man* (as he calls his Opponent) of whom he saith, *It might seem like casting Pearls before Swine, that so dares to tread under his dirty Feet, such precious Truths of Scripture*; not for *his, and his Sadducean Fraternity's* (as he miscalls Friends) but for *others*, who he hopes *will gather them up, and value them, for the worth of them.* To which I say, They must not be very *valuable* themselves; who gather up, and value up such

Page, 12.

Husky

Husky Notions. Again, I query, Whether that Food (that according to G. *Keith*, was turned into Christs real Flesh, which Flesh was further changed after the Resurrection, and became Incorruptible, as *G. Keith* saith) be the same in substance, that it was before the change, and when Corruptible, ?

Now I come to what the Friend saith, in his p. 33. with respect to the Soul, 'As for the Soul '(saith he) it was a Spiritual substance in its 'self, before its Sanctifying, as after (so is not 'the Body) so that such a change is surely RA-'THER a Purification than a Transmutation, 'even as the washing of a Body besmeared with 'Dirt, when cleansed, is a Purification, and not 'a Transmutation. Upon which *G. Keith*, quoting only from where he saith [a change is surely] thus hath it, *But still this Ignorant Presumptuous Man runs himself rashly upon the sharp Pricks. Formerly he hath Laboured in vain to destroy the Felicity of the Body of a Saint, and now he Labours as much in vain to destroy the Felicity of his Soul, that he makes the Work of Regeneration in the Soul of Man, to be* nothing else *but a Purification from Sin, as when a Body besmeared with Dirt, is cleansed, that is a Purification, and not a Transmutation. I never heard, nor read* (saith he) *a more Ignorant and Non-Sensical Assertion. Answer*, Nor I, a more *bold Forgery:* For where doth the Friend Labour to destroy the Felicity of either Soul or Body? Where doth he make the work of Regeneration NOTHING ELSE but a Purification, *&c.* Though he saith, it is RATHER so,

than

than a Transmutation, which was *G. Keith*'s phrase? He needed not therefore have queried (as he doth p. 13.) *What is this but to make the Souls of the Saints, nothing but so many* Tabulæ Rasæ, *Washed Tables without any beautiful Colours, or lively Portraiture on them? Is then the Image of God in the Saints no positive thing, but a freedom from Sin, or a Negation of it? Is Holiness nothing but a Negation of unholiness*, &c? Nor to have added, *O wretched Ignorance! And O Lamentable shame that falls upon the Second Days Weekly Meeting of the People called Quakers, for approving such Antichristian Doctrine*, &c, For as the Friend did not deny, that man after his Restoration becometh really Holy, and hath a divine Image, the Image of the Heavenly stamped upon him, even so that the Soul hath the Impression thereof, which yet may be, without change of substance: So *G. Keith* himself, as little Charity as he useth to have for us or him, seems to allow *C. Busey will not stand to it, upon better Consideration*, which shews *G. Keith* hath been fighting with his own shadow all this while, who thus goes on. Page, 13.

But if on better Consideration he be ashamed of his rash assertion [Is *G. Keith* ashamed of his false Charge?] *and come to acknowledge, that the Soul by Regeneration, not only is purified from Sin, but wonderfully Changed and transformed, from Natural or Animal, to Spiritual, from Earthly* [Is the Soul Earthly?] *to Heavenly*, and yet the same in substance, *let him acknowledge that the mighty Power of God, through Christ that*

hath

hath thus Changed the Soul, retaining the same Substance, can and will change the low Body of a Saint, and fashion it like the Glorious Body of Christ, &c. *Answer*, As he misapplies what was said by *Paul*, of the Natural Body, to the Change or Transformation of the Soul; so neither do his Parallels hold: For the Soul that is Immortal, is of nearer affinity to Spiritual, than the Mortal which puts on Immortality, and the addition it receives of Beauty and Glory, do not Change its Substance: But what is this to the vile low or Corruptible Body, which is as diametrically opposit to Glorious and Eternal and Incorruptible, as any thing can be? Can that be changed into Incorruptible and Spiritual, and yet the substance the same, as when corruptible, Fleshly and Mortal?

This indeed he would fain have us grant, and in the next Paragraph pretends to *demonstrate, how a natural and Corruptible substance hath been Changed into a Spiritual one*, he should have added, *and yet the substance not Changed*, for that is the matter in debate, and whereupon *C. Pusey* hath compared his Notion as equally Contradictory to Reason, with that of Transubstantiation. However he attempts to prove it thus, *The Food which our Saviour received into his Body, was it not before he received it, Corruptible?* saith he, and answers, *Yea, surely it was, and what part of that Food became part of his Body and Flesh it was turned or changed into Incorruptible*, &c. p. 13. 14. Answer, I did observe (though I have not noted it before) that

Page, 14.

that in *Truth Advanced*, p. 119. he ſaid, *The inferior Creatures, by a ſort of innate appetite and deſire, encline to be joyned unto Man, as their Head, and to be his Food, that ſo they may attain to their Perfection and Reſtoration in him, which they cannot attain unto otherwiſe:* But I let that paſs then, having ſtore of abſurdities beſides to load him with, yet now he having taken a larger ſtep, to embody them with the Heavenly Man, the Lord from Heaven, ſhall ſhall I not ſay with a cauſe (as himſelf did but lately without a cauſe) *O wretched Ignorance! O Lamentable ſhame!* He that tells the Friend, that *as a Shooemaker goes beyond his Laſt, ſo he beyond his Sphere of knowledge*, What becomes of our *Maſter* of *Arts* now? Had he not better have kept to his employ, of teaching of School-Boys, than thus to go beyond his Sphere of knowledge, as to draw ſuch Inferences, which would fetch in the very Beaſts of the Field, Fowls of the Air and Fiſh of the Sea, to become part of Chriſts Body and Fleſh in Heaven?

A ſecond thing I obſerve in that very Paragraph, p. 14. is, that he cites *Malice of Independent Agent*, p. 17. which he aſſigns to *G. Whitehead* as the Author of, to prove that the Body of Chriſt *is at preſent an Incorruptible Subſtance*, The words I find in ſaid Page to be thus, 'Seeing we have always believed and 'confeſſed the Immortality and entire beings 'of the Souls of all other men, it muſt needs 'be evidently unjuſt to accuſe us with denying 'the Manhood of Chriſt, or *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*,

' to have a being both as to his Soul and Body. And seeing *G. Keith* hath Read this, and thereby perceived that the Divine existence of Christs Manhood in Heaven was so fully acknowledged, what a kind of Man must he be to insinuate the contrary against *G. Whitehead.*

The Friend having shewed that *G. Keith* had asserted, that *the grossy part* (*called by* Paul Corruption) *is not proper to Man as Man, nor no proper part of Mans Body, and the other part Corrupteth not*, argueth thus, ' How then is it said ' of *David* that *he slept with his Fathers and saw* ' *Corruption*, and of *Job*, *I have said of Corrup-* ' *tion*, *Thou art my Father?* &c. And how is ' Man in Scripture, called Corruptible Man? See his p. 32. This *G. Keith* calls *Wrangling and Quibling from his own gross Misunderstanding of some places of Scripture* [but he doth not enform him better, though he adds] *if he will take these Scriptures strictly and litterally, he must as much contend against the Immortality of the Soul, as the Resurrection of the Body*, &c. But why so? Doth *G. Keith* manifest wherein? Or give any proof that these Scriptures are not to be taken strictly and litterally? Nothing less. They were pat and *argumentum ad hominem* to him, the enervating whereof he shifts by huffing. What he adds of the *mortal Body of Man being truly said to be Corruptible, because it consists of two Heterogeneous parts, the one noble, the other ignoble, to wit the Husk, Dross or Cortex, and after the Separation of the Noble from the ignoble, is not Corrupt*, &c. Is not *ad rem.* The question

question is not about Husk, Dross or Cortex, but of what was proper to Man as Man, whether that Corrupts, and how *David* could be said to see Corruption, or *Job*, that Corruption was his Father, *&c.* If nothing of Man as Man be Corrupt, the which he hath rather sought to evade than answer.

The like the Friend urged from *G. Keith*'s saying, *The Man-Eaters may eat the gross part of Mans Body, yet that more subtile and Invisible part, they cannot eat*, asking, 'What is this but to say, the Man-eaters may eat Mans Body, but they cannot eat the substance of Mans Body? p. 34. 35. This *G. Keith* never cites, yet infers from it, that *he would with his devouring Throat Eat or Swallow up the Resurrection of the Body*, which shews *G. Keith* is *better Skilled in the Art of Railing than disputing*; he knows who called that *a Black Art* once, with something more I may chance to put him in mind of, before we part (see *Way Cast up*, p. 169.) Besides *C. Pusey* did not seek to Swallow up the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, but to detect his explication, as unsound and unscriptural, as well as Contradictory

But how doth it appear that his Opponent *joyneth with* Atheists *and* Sadducees *in arguing against the Resurrection of the Body (being the same in substance) from the Man-Eaters*, as *G. Keith* charged him? Do the *Atheists* and *Saducees* acknowledge there is a Resurrection, yet not the same in substance? Or doth not the one deny there is a God, Heaven or Hell, and the o-

ther that *there is a Resurrection* (at all) *or An-gel, or Spirit*, as in *Acts* 23. 8. Are these Cases Parallel? Or is it not rather manifest that G. Keith's Suggestions are as false, as they are ma-licious? Who no longer ago than in the Year 1691. in his Book, called, *Presbyterian and In-dependent Churches*, tells his Reader, *It is a no-torious false Charge, that we deny the Manhood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and affirm, that as Man he is not in Heaven, or that we deny the Resur-rection of the Dead: But because we deny the carnal Conceptions of the Resurrection, and bind us to Scripture Words, which is most safe, there-fore they have so belied us*, saith he, p. 21-228. And the Case is the same now betwee[illegible] us and him.

C. Pusey further saith in his p. 35. 'Is not this 'contrary to that common Understanding th[illegible] 'God hath given Man, as the Popish Doctrin[illegible] 'of Transubstantiation. For the Papists sa[illegible] 'Though as to their Sense, they eat the ver[illegible] 'Bread, it having the very colour, the smel[illegible] 'the taste and shew of Bread, yet the Substan[illegible] 'of Bread they eat not: So *G. Keith* holds 'That though Man-Eaters may eat the visib[illegible] 'Part of Mans Body, which is seen with th[illegible] 'outward Eyes, yet the Matter and Substan[illegible] 'of Mans Body they cannot eat, *&c.* This G. *Keith*, though he gives us not the Friend[illegible] Words, inveighs loudly against, saying, *Fro[illegible] this he most nonsensically inferrs, that I affirm t[illegible] Man-Eaters eat the accidents of Mans Body*, &[illegible] Again, *I neither said nor thought the Man-Eate[illegible] eat only the accidents*, &c. This he Ter[illegible]

qu[illegible]

ibbling, partly from his gross Ignorance, and partly from the Perversion and Prejudice of his Spirit. But what shall I say of G. Keith, who gives not the Friends Words at all, yet foistth in, as said by him, what there is not a Syllable of in the Book; no mention of *accidents*, the Word not so much as named, for I have given almost the whole of what was said there in that Subject? Whence came this, but from *Perversion and Prejudice of Spirit*, not *gross Ignorance*, for it was done *wittingly*? He goes on, *I distinguished betwixt the Radix and principal Substance of Mans Body, and the drossy Part which is frequently separated from the noble volatile Part, by Chymical Operations. Answ.* Thus he makes two Substances to Mans Body, and the Man-Eaters to be the Chymists to make this separation. But supposing these Man-Eaters eat not the Body, till *after a Year more or less*, in which time he allows (*Truth Advanced*, p. 17.) *the Separation may be made betwixt the Kernel and the drossy Part*, do they then eat Mans Body? Or do they not? Or what is it they do eat, if that be not Mans Body? And whereas he back this Assertion, he queries, p. 15. *Were Robbers that swallowed down Gold, did eat it?* Answer, The Instance is very remote, except he could prove they eat the drossy Part, and not the more refined behind them, then it had better suited his Purpose, But what he instances in *Iron*, the Demonstration is more obvious; Men do not eat Iron, because they do not digest it, but the Ostrich, that digests it, is said to eat Iron. Query, Whether the *Sub-*

Page 15.

ſtance of Iron, when eaten, the excrementitious Part voided, and the more noble Part transmuted into real Fleſh in the Oſtrich (a Notion he hath favoured in p. 12. and I have commented upon) be *the ſame*, as before it was eaten? And to his laſt clauſe in the Paragraph, *viz. As every Body hath a diſtinct Seed, ſo the Radix of every Body is a diſtinct Radix*, I ſay, if every Body have it's diſtinct Seed and Radix, then Man's Body before the Fall had ſo, and muſt there be a Radix to the Cloathes alſo? To the Coats of Skins (which he interpreteth, *Truth Advanced*, p. 27. to be the Skin and Fleſh of this frail, mortal and corruptible Body) to that which he ſaith, *Ibid.* p. 113. is not proper to Man as Man, and this ſuch a Radix, as the Man-Eaters cannot eat with the droſs and husky Part? The Miller, whom he would *ſend to his Mill*, and cautioneth not to *go beyond his Sphear of Knowledge*, is a better *Philoſopher* than this comes to.

Now after all his bluſter of *Sadducees*, *Sadducean Fraternity*, &c. he brings in his Opponent owning a *Reſurrection of Juſt and Unjuſt*, though to help himſelf off, he brands him with *great Hypocriſy*, who being a prejudiced Adverſary, and offering no reaſonable Demonſtration; I ſubmit it to the Candid to make their Judgment of both of them, and ſo leave it. Nor ſhall I now debate with him, whether the *Primitive Chriſtians were come to any reſult about what their Bodies ſhould be*: It is ſufficient, that he hath not detected us, whatever he would have Men believe concerning us, to

have

have deviated from the Faith of the Resurrection, or from *Scripture Terms and Expressions*, to which he hath said it is *only safe to keep in this and all other things*, as hath been instanced.

To *C. Pusey*'s query, 'If it was the common 'belief of the Primitive Christians, that the 'very same Matter and Substance of this cor-'ruptible Body, should be the Body that is rai-'sed, why should any, among themselves espe-'cially, have asked such a needless Question, 'as with what Body do they come? *G. Keith* Answers, *Such who asked that Question, were such among them, that said there was no Resurrection of the Dead*, 1 Cor. 15. 12. *Answ.* This is no ways deduceable from that Scripture, nor any other that I can find: For the Question asked *ver.* 12. was answered, and a new one raised *ver.* 35. to which in *ver.* 36. *Paul* replied, *Thou Fool*, &c. The one said *there is no Resurrection*, the other disputed inquisitively about the *Modus*, or Manner of it, *how?* And *with what Body?* And were distinctly answered. So that *in this* G. Keith *grosly errs, and needs Correction*, as he once told the *Rector* of *Arrow*.

But the Translation [with what Body] doth not please him, who seems to think well of nothing, but what himself hath a Hand in. He would have it, *with what quality* [why not rather, what kind?] *of Body*, and adds, *this their querying, was a sort of arguing against the thing it self*, p. 16. First he imposeth his own Version, then a Dogmatical Inference without Page 16.

Proof, which as such I reject, as I do also his slander against us, a little below, that *we argue against the Resurrection of the Body it self, from the Manner of it.*

Against *C. Pusey*'s having shewed *G. Keith* his contradictory Assertions to be as little reconcileable to Reason, as the Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation, *G. Keith* alledgeth, *that professing to hold a Resurrection of the Body, but not of that same Substance, falls in with the Popish Transubstantiation. Answ.* Surely to say, *It is no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, but a pure ethereal, or heavenly Body*, and yet that the *Substance remaineth the same, that it was on Earth*, which *G. Keith* hath confessed to, p. 4. is more like their Doctrine, who say, The Form of Bread remains, yet it is the real Flesh and Blood of Christ, than our saying with the Scriptures, *Thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but God giveth it a Body, as it hath pleased him, and to every Seed its own Body*, 1 Cor. 15. 37, 38. For as he hath said in another Place, we *have good Company* (even the Apostle *Paul*) *on our side*, which he hath not for himself.

What follows as a Charge against *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, *That the Saints get the Resurrection immediately after Death*, and that *they both argue against the Deceased Saints expecting any Resurrection of the Body*, &c. He not offering to prove upon them, out of any of their Books, I lightly pass over, as knowing *G. Keith* too well, to trust to his general Accusations, and them better than to Credit such Evidence against them. Nor shall I engage in what he further offers,

offers, p. 17. relating to their differences in *America*, whereto I am not Privy: Yet may say, that a free and bold laying open of our Sufferings, when hardly and illegally dealt with (as in the Case of *W. Penn* and *W. Mead* their Tryals) bears no Proportion to giving a Magistrate ill Language and provoking Terms, for *we have not so learned Christ*. Neither need *G. Keith* ask his Opponent, p. 18. a Proof, *that he is a Man of a wrong Spirit?* adding, *What one evil thing hath be proved against me in all his Book, either in Doctrine or Conversation?* For any that compares the Book and Answer together, in a *right Spirit*, will see there is sufficient to detect *G. Keith* to be of a *wrong Spirit*: And what is wanting there, himself hath made up since, in *bitterness*, in *envy*, in *reviling* and *slandering Gods Heritage*, which I pray he may be sensible of, before too late. Page 17. Page 18.

In p. 18. *G. Keith* makes a general Reference to what *C. Pusey* gave (in several Pages) out of his *Truths Defence*, p. 169, 170, 171. And upon the whole saith, he *remains in the same Mind still, that he would have nothing urged, nor pressed as Articles of Faith, but what is delivered to us in plain express Scripture Words*, which (he saith) *is the Substance of that large Citation. Answ.* The Substance of that Citation was more comprehensive than so, as who so please to read it in the Original cited above, may find, wherein he declares that Charity and makes those Proposals of Concord with the otherwise Minded, as suits not with his late Actions. Yet from what he hath here given,

ven, as the Substance of that large Citation, the Friend Objects, p. 53. that *this Advice could not find Place with* G. Keith, *when so often desired*, and queries, 'What Uncharitableness 'is this, when we offer to express our Faith 'in Scripture Words, for you to say, we have 'another Sense than what we speak, see his p. '54. *G. Keith* makes Answer, *It is false in him to say, that this was so often desired, but could not find Place — I said again and again, We shall take your Confession in Scripture Words, provided ye will condemn your Errors, that are contrary to express Scripture Words — But this* (saith he) *they would never do.* And perhaps they held no such Errors, as he charged them with, and so had none to condemn, say I: However this being true, that such an offer was made by Friends, and thus replied to by him (which is so far from *never refusing*, that it includeth a refusal, in tying them to such Terms, as no Innocent Man can comply with, without an implicit acknowledgment of Guilt) the next thing I observe is, that whereas his Opponent queried, *How know ye that we have a Sense contrary to Scripture Words*, G. Keith Answers, *They have sufficiently discovered it, not only by one or two unsound Expressions, but Multitudes of them, as their Letters, and Manuscripts there, and the Printed Books here*, sufficiently prove. *Answ.* This Reference is wide enough: What is in their Letters and Manuscripts there, we know not, nor are we like, for ought I see, though he hath long threatned us with them? Again, what Printed Books here, doth he mean? What

is

is their Title? In what Page? Who the Author? Surely he thinks his Credit is great, that the Reader must take all from him, upon trust, without Examination. But at length he comes to one particular Case, by which we may give a guess of the rest. It is *in hæc verba.*

We need go no further for a Proof (saith he) *than the most gross and Antichristian Expressions and Sayings of* Caleb Pusey *himself, in this very Treatise, for whereas he hath plainly affirmed* p. 15. ad finem, *That* Jesus *of* Nazareth *cannot be something else than the Light, Power and Spirit within. Now can there be any thing more contrary to express Scripture, than this Assertion: Was not* Jesus *of* Nazareth *a real Man, consisting of Soul and Body, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily? — And is that Body, and that Soul, and that fulness nothing else but the Light within us? O abominable Non-sense, and Perversion, and Contradiction to Scripture, and all true Reason! Ans.* By that Time I have given *C. Pusey* his Words, I doubt not but to make appear that *G. Keith* is a Man *nullius fidei*, not to be trusted: For this he calls a *plain Affirmation*, was but an Inference or Deduction from what *G. Keith* had laid down, and no ways designed, as here alledged, to deny *Jesus* of *Nazareth* to be both God and Man. *C. Pusey*, p. 15, 16. thus hath it, 'Seing *G. Keith*'s Answer to *R. Gordon*, 'implies, that the Light, Power and Spirit 'within, is Christ the only Mediator and Sa-'viour, and that so to assert is not to assert 'another Christ than *Jesus* of *Nazareth*, then 'surely *Jesus* of *Nazareth* cannot be something

'else

'else than the Light, Power and Spirit within, 'because *Jesus* of *Nazareth* is the ONLY Christ, 'Mediator and Saviour, and SO is the Light, 'Power and Spirit within acknowledged to 'be. And if the same, then not any thing else. Thus far *C. Pusey*, now where is *G. Keith* his Inference? Where the *Antichristianism?* Where the *abominable Non-sense, Perversion and Contradiction to Scripture*, &c? Where doth the Friend deny him to be a real Man, consisting of Soul and Body, or that he is our Mediator and Saviour? Nay if applicable to either of them, it must be to *G. Keith* himself, whose the Assertion is; not to *C. Pusey* for citing it, and arguing from it *ad hominem*. He that will so palpably abuse a Man to *his Face*, as I may so say, when Evidence so near to be produced, what will he do *behind his back?* But perhaps he thought every Reader would not scan it, and so it might have passed.

From *G. Keith* his having in that Book of *Truth's Defence* urged, that nothing should be pressed as Articles of Faith, but what is delivered in plain Expressions of Scripture Words, the Friend put seven Queries to him, from p. 56, to 59. wherein he demands express Words of Scripture for several of *G. Keith* his Assertions, whereof *G. Keith* takes no notice (except of the third Query, about the four hundred Pieces of Silver *Abraham* Purchased the Burying Place with, which I have remarked under my second Head) but gives him six Queries, by way of Retortion. To which I say, when he hath answered those Queries, ground-

ed

ed upon his own thesis, whereby he ought to be bound, I may give an answer to his, which as stated, are not our Principles, but his own unfair deductions.

He goes on, p. 19. *Though I remain still in the same mind, that no Article of Faith should be urged, on any, but what is Contained in plain express words of Scripture, or so agreeable to express Scripture, as the common sense of all Mankind, that hears Scripture words, must acknowledge*, &c.—*Yet I see not why I should be so confined to express Scripture words, in things that I require no man to own or believe, as Articles of Faith*, &c. And towards the bottom, *For there are many things, both in my Book called* Truth Advanced, *and in many other of my Books, wherein I may possibly differ from others in Judgment, yet I leave them to their Liberty to dissent, as I desire to be left to my Liberty, to believe as I judge God hath persuaded me. Answer*, Waving the additional Terms [so agreeable to express Scripture, as common sense, *&c.*] wherein he is likely enough to make himself the Judge, what is and what is not so, I tell him, Of what kind many of his are, even with respect to Articles of Faith, hath in part been manifest, and have been Communicated in several parts of this my treatise; yet we deny him not a Liberty to dissent, as persuaded in himself, so long as his Dissent affects himself only, and he is not quarrelsom with us, stigmatizing us as *Atheists*, *Sadducees*, *Sadducean Fraternity*, &c. As he hath done, upon account of doctrines himself allows to be Articles of the Christian

Page, 19.

Christian Faith, yet therein hath run so wide from Scripture Terms and Expressions, as hath been shewed. But we would, if possible, hold him to his own rule, that if it be only safe to keep close to Scripture words and expressions, he should do it, at least in Articles of Faith, of which that of the Resurrection is one. And in as much as he urgeth upon us, p. 39. That Scripture (1 *Pet.* 3. 15.) of being ready to give an answer of the reason of the hope that is in us, surely it cannot be amiss in us to demand the like of him, as well as to shew the reason of our dissent from him, where we find him incongruous and absurd, as well as Unscriptural.

Page 20. What remains, p. 20. Being but a repetition of his former Slanders, relating to the *sufficiency of the Light within, so excluding our Lord Jesus of* Nazareth, *his Death, Sufferings,* &c. *From being Concerned in our Salvation*, and his suggesting our not *owning Justification by Christs Blood outwardly shed*, as he offers no Proof, though he hath oft asserted the Contrary on our behalf, I shall barely reject them as false Charges, not desiring to fatigue my Reader. And now for a close of this part, *G. Keith* having so often insulted over his Opponent, as a *Miller Philosopher, one going beyond his Last, his Sphere of knowledge, who had better keep working at his Mill, to his own Trade of Grinding or Sawing Timber* (See p. 5.11.15. *&c.*) I shall wind up these with some few instances, declaring what himself once thought and said of that, whereupon he now so values himself,

ſelf, as an indication, that even herein, the Man is changed from *better* to *worſe*.

In his Book called, *Help in time of need* (Printed *Anno.* 1665.) he thus ſaith, 'Away 'with the education of Youth at Univerſities 'and Colledges of Philoſophy, ſo called. I 'may ſay of them, which *Luther* ſtuck not to 'call them in his *Day*, that they are the *ſtews* '*of Antichriſt*, p. 75. 76. Again, p. 76. 'And 'the Philoſophy, ſo called, which is taught 'them, is but meer *Deceit* and *Pedantry*, which 'even I came to ſee, when among them— And towards the bottom, 'I certainly know 'the Human Wiſdom or Learning is one of 'the MAIN Bulwarks of Antichriſt againſt 'the Revelation, and ſetting up the King-'dom of Chriſt in the Earth, and becauſe 'this is ariſing, and ſhall riſe, down muſt the 'other go, and all who ſeek to uphold it, '*ſhall fall* therewith. Surely then *G. Keith* hath no ſuch great cauſe to vaunt himſelf over another, for his Skill in that Learning, which himſelf confeſſeth to be a main Bulwark of Antichriſt, which muſt fall with its upholders; wherein *G. Keith* may chance to be a truer Prophet againſt himſelf, than he is aware of.

In his Book of *Immediate Revelation* (Printed *Anno.* 1676.) he ſaith, 'Then down ſhould 'all the PROUD, LORDING, LOFTY 'CLERGY, with their many degrees of DO-'CTORSHIPS, LORDSHIPS and MASTER-'SHIPS, paſs, who being Strangers to the 'true knowledge——are vainly puffed up in

'their

'their Fleshly minds, by the form of know-
'ledge in the Letter, *as I was my self*, whilst
'among them, and thought all Men *Idiots*
'and *Unlearned*, who were not Skilled in that
'litteral knowledge; but the Lord, by his
'Grace, brought me to see the Vanity of
'all that knowledge, *&c.* p. 137. *But* [now]
it is happened unto [him] *according to the true Proverb, The Dog is turned to his own Vomit again*, &c. 2 *Pet.* 2. 22. And what God once brought him to see the Vanity of, is again become his Glory, so that he again thinks such to be Idiots and Fools, who are not Skilled in that Pedantry himself formerly was (and of late is) vainly puffed up by, though if he will believe himself (*Truths Defence*, P. 69. Printed *Anno.* 1684.) he hath no such great cause, for he there saith, 'As
'to my Learning, that is but very ordinary,
'and a thing I neither can nor OUGHT to
'glory in. His Learning I shall not endeavour to debase: His Glorying in it, and depreciating others for want of it, whilst himself hath represented that kind of knowledge so pernicious, is what drew me to offer these, which leaving with the Reader, I thus conclude my answer to his Cavils against the Book stiled *Modest Account*, and betake my self to *G. Keith's Postscript*, who thus introduceth himself, p. 40.

Page, 40. *It may seem strange, how it comes to pass* (saith *G. Keith*) *that while so many pious and Learned Men are Judged to be found in this Nation, not only of the Church of* England, *but among the Dissenters*

Dissenters and Non-Conformists, there are found so few among them all, that do imply their gifts to oppose such Vile Errors, *as are boldly and avowedly promoted among a sort an* GANG *of the People called Quakers, not only as bad as* ANY *Popery, but* MUCH WORSE *than the* WORST *of Popery, in divers respects,* &c. *Answer;* What those Principles of ours are, which he counts *much worse than the worst of Peopery*, he is so far from proving upon us (though he exclaims as virulently, as the *Jews* of Old, who said, *Men of* Israel *help, This is the Man that teacheth all men every where, against the People, and the law, and this place*, Act. 21. 28.) that he doth not so much as name them. The Papists Doctrine of Transubstantiation, of Purgatory, of Invocation of Saints (which is at least a tacit rejecting of Christs Mediatorship) and their deifying the *Virgin Mary*, as the Saviour of Mankind, with attributes to God and Christ, are so bad in my Judgment, whatever they are in his, that there need none *worse*. And if our Principles had really been *much worse* than the *worst* of these, methinks his Pious and Learned Men (of all Perswasions) should not have been so supine these 40. Years, that they need now to be stirred up, to creep in at the Tail of an *Apostate*, to do his Drudgery for him, and that such an one, who not only makes such poor earnings of it, but (perhaps for 25. Years together) hath defended us and our Principles against them, and particularly in his *Looking-Glass for Protestants*, Printed *Anno*. 1674. ex-

deavoureth to *make it appear* (as he gives out, in the Title-Page) *that the Quakers are the truest Protestants, because* (as he there saith) *their Testimony agreeth with the Testimony of the Antient Protestants, in the most weighty things*, &c. And whereas he denominateth us a *gang*, I would fain know what Gang he is of now? And I was going to put a harder Question to him, what Gang he intends to be of next, but that I believe he cannot resolve me, neither knowing his own Mind, nor who will trust him. Yet by what follows, he bids fair for the Papists, as if he had an Aking Tooth after them.

I am Confident, saith he, *if such Antichristian Errors and Heresies were but the* TENTH PART *so avowedly broached in the City of* Rome, *or any where else in Popish Countries, these esteemed Watchmen among them, would be more alarmed to oppose them*, &c. *Then most among Protestants do.* There's a Box on the Ear for such as will not be at his Beck. Methinks he rates his betters, as if he had got a Benefice already: But stay, *Ad huc tua seges in herba est*, he must learn more Manners to his Benefactors, if he expect Promotion, who, if he be thus malapert now, what will he be, when he hath caught the Fish.

Now to make sure Work of it, he labours yet further to incense the *National Ministers* against us (and upon the *Civil Powers*, yet would fain Men should think, *It is farr from him to desire the least Sufferings to come on our Persons or Estates*, as he pretends in the next Page: But as the *Dutchman* says, **Wit gaet zo verre als hy voeton heeft**, it goes as far as it hath Legs to stand on) in Order

der whereto, he layeth before them, *That we have provoked such as have differed from us, to publick Disputes* Vivâ voce, *and have oft gloried over them, who refused to answer us, that their cause was Bad*, &c. He knows who hath said, *Deceit lurks in Generals:* Will he assign Time, Place and Person, perhaps he may be answered, for Circumstances of things much vary the Case. They may have detracted us behind our backs *Vivâ voce*, they may have insulted over us, when absent, *&c.* with more that I might insist on. But if he will accuse, let him descend to particulars; till then wonder not (Reader) that I reject such Evidence. The Case with him, which Galls him, and makes him wince so, is that when he had defamed and falsly aspersed us in Print, to which we answered by Print, we could not be drawn to quit that Defence, by a *Vivâ voce* debate, to which he had summoned us. Now not being gratified here, and we objecting the inequitableness of such a procedure, the turbulency of the Man (whereof this present *Postscript* is a sufficient Indication) and the unsuitableness of the time, with respect to the Publick Peace of the Nation, he bursts out into this Extravagancy, as if he designed that Men of all Ranks should be let loose upon us.

In Order whereto he applies himself in the next Place to the *Civil Authority*, telling them, p. 41. *It would be a commendable and praise-worthy thing, to encourage such a Practice throughout the Nation, that Men of true Piety and Solid Learning might be allowed and countenanced to refute these vile and abominable Errors, of these chief Leaders* Page 41.

and Teachers among the Quakers, *at the end of their Meetings*, &c. *and to give Order, that all such Books of them called* Quakers, *as can readily be found* (*as great store of such there are*, he saith) *that contain such vile and abominable Errors*, &c. *may be suppressed and witnessed against by publick Authority. Answ.* I doubt not but this Work would please him well, especially if he might have an *Inquisitors* place of it, whereby he might both gratifie his revenge against the *Quakers*, and also pick up some little income to help him against that *ruine and want*, which *W. Penn* his calling him *Apostate*, tended to *expose* him to, as himself complains, *Advertisement*, p. 4. Yet two things I would put him in Mind of, first, that he even now Proposed, that *with what measure we have met to others, with the same to mete to us again.* Would he have been willing to have been thus served, by the Powers of this Nation, when he termed *Prelacy a Limb of Antichrist, and declared how he had vowed to God against it, which vow we have kept to* (saith he to the *Presbyterians*) *ye have shrunk from* (see *Help in time of need*, p. 37, 39. Printed *Anno* 1665.) or by a *Presbyterian* Ministry and Magistracy, whose *Form of Church Discipline, Order and Government*, he hath represented (*Ibid.* p. 52.) *nothing upon the Matter better than the Episcopal*, as well as told a Preacher of that Communion, he was *better skilled in the Art of Railing* (*a black Art to be sure*, saith *G. Keith, too familiar to the Tribe of Black Coats*) *than in the way of Disputing* (*Way cast up*, p. 169.) Doth he think these are not reputed *Vile Errors* and Slanders by the Men of that way on which he hath thus reflected? And though perhaps he would

would now turn both *Coat* and *Colour*, and no more talk thus sawcily of *black Art*, and *Tribe of black Coats*, provided he might be Dignified with some Ecclesiastical Preferment; yet these are what he hath not yet *retracted* at least in Publick, as well as that I from hence Appeal to him, whether he would have been so served himself, as he now animates others to serve us? The second thing I would mind him of, is that this, however palliated by him, is *Persecution*, for it excites the Magistrate, not only to supervise, but also SUPPRESS, what he shall call *vile and abominable Errors*, of which it makes him *Judge*, which how acceptable it would be to the Protestant Dissenters in general, to have their Books thus come under the Scrutiny, and be liable to be exposed to the judicial censure of their Antagonists, I leave to them to consider. Yet I think it is obvious, that the Buddings of Reformation, in any Age, were never due to such Courses, for it must suppose the Magistrate to be still in the right, whether the Government be *Papistical*, *Prelatical*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Baptist*, yea or *Quakers*, if that were supposeable, as well that it had been a ready way to have suppressed the spreading of the *New Testament*, by *Jew* and *Gentile*, in the first Promulgation of the Gospel, and of translating the Bible since the Reformation from Popery, it not being to be doubted, but the Men then in Authority were as likely to brand those Holy Writings, or the Translations at least, with as opprobrious Names, as *G. Keith* now bestows upon us; and if they might have been allowed to be both *Judge and Jury*, no Question but they would

would have made quick dispatch. But that a *pretended* Protestant (yea one who hath valued himself as a Quaker, for 33 Years together, and hath not as yet renounced the Name) should advise the present Powers (who have given us a larger and better founded Liberty, than in the foregoing Reigns) to suppress the Religious Tracts of such, whom he once reputed as Brethren, and whose Doctrines he defended against them as Orthodox, for so many Years together, is what I need not aggravate: It speaks for it self.

But the Occasion of this Fury is soon explained, *viz.* After he had been litigous in *America*, he or some of his Agents Laboured to Transmit the difference hither, by sending over several Contentious Books of *G. Keith*'s, which some Friends here, both desiring *G. Keith* might be restored into Unity again, and himself come to see and acknowledge his Evil therein, and also to prevent that difference dilating it self to the scandal of our Profession, and the stumbling of the weak, bought up several of those Books, and kept them from being dispersed. This is what he calls giving LARGE MONEY (whom he compares us to, by the Expression, is easie to gness) and this heats him to that degree, that he would fain irritate the National Clergy and Powers to disturb our Meetings, as well as suppress our Books, who then might Scribble and Scribble again, and never be pestered with Replies.

Hence it is, that he is so clamorous against the Second Days Morning Meeting at *London* (to whom himself formerly (at some times) hath applied

plied himself, when he had Books to Print, particularly, those Books called *Light of Truth*, and *Divine Immediate Revelation*, were *read* and *approved* there, as he confesseth, p.5, and 22.) for he saith in his p.3. *They assume a Power to license and approve of all Books that are to be Printed by any of their Party, and have approved this Book falsly called a* Modest Account, *and all the late scandalous Books of* Tho. Ellwood *and* John Penington *come forth against me* [Ay that's their crime, that they approve of Books, which detect him] *and claim Authority over all other Meetings (the Yearly Meeting perhaps excepted) sending out their Circular Letters to all other Meetings, in all Parts of the World*, &c. *Answ.* Shall Men of different perswasions from us be empowered to inspect our Books, stamp their *Cum Privilegio* upon the one, and suppress the other; and shall not we, among our selves, have the Liberty to supervise what we can stand by, what not, before exposed to the view and censure of Men otherwise Minded? He is willing we should have the reproach, obloquy and Sufferings due (in his Judgment to *vile and abominable Errors*, while he reflects upon our care to prevent both the one and the other, by first supervising our own Books, our selves, that as what comes forth he would make to affect the whole Society, so it may be overlooked by faithful and approved Men of that Society. O unreasonable Man! Yet would he be ingenious, it is evident, by his own Example formerly, that it is not so much our Order, and Practice, as our Judgment relating to him and his late envious Pieces, under which he is so uneasie, that he goes on.

To

To whom [*viz.* the second Days Meeting] *the Meetings from all places direct their Letters upon any Occurrence of difference*,&c. *Answ.* This is false in Fact, that Meeting claims no such Authority, assumes no such Power, neither is it invested in them. He adds, *The which Meeting may be fitly compared to the Conclave of* Cardinals *at* Rome, *but who is the Metropolitan at present, of this new erected Hierarchy at* London *is not certainly known, as whether* W. Penn *or* G. Whitehead. *Answ.* The *Pious* and *Learned* among the Church of *England*, are little beholden to *G. Keith*, to set them upon such a VWork, which in us he upbraids as fitly comparable to the *Roman Hierarchy*: Surely their Piety and Learning might be better employed. To the rest, I ask him, when he knew us to have a *Metropolitan* among us; and if we had one now, whether it were likely he could be so ignorant, as not to know which of the two, it was, whether *W. Penn* or *G. Whitehead*: But *G. Keith* hath worded it *cautiously*, as well as *malitiously*; seeing what never was, can never be certainly known. Might he himself have been a Metropolitan, I doubt not but he would have been willing to have continued longer among us: For he cavilleth at what he (*Diotrephes* like) coveted for himself, and proveth quarrelsom because we could not allow him, the preheminence he sought after: For we have none such among us, nor do we own any Head but Christ.

And now Reader, having traced the Man through his *Contradictions*, through his *Absurdities*, through his *Envy* and *Bitterness* here exposed, and having defended my Self and Friends from the *empty Cavils* of the Book under Consideration, I submit the foregoing to thy Impartial Examination, to be weighed by thee in that Ballance, which giveth rightly to judge, both as a Man, and as a Christian, and bid thee farewel.

John Penington.

Beel-house, 28. of
6th. Month 1696.

If they call the Master of the House Beelzebub, *how much more them of his Houshold?* Mat. 10. 25.

THE END.